DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 036 CG 013 095

AUTHOR Candee, Daniel; And Others
TITLE Moral Development and Life Outcomes. [Main Report and Executive Summary].
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 78
GRANT NIE-6-74-0096
NOTE 116p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); Attitudes; *Cognitive Processes; *Economic Status; *Ethical Values; Interpersonal Competence; *Job Satisfaction; Males; *Moral Development; Parent Role; Research Projects
IDENTIFIERS Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position

ABSTRACT

Individuals who differ in moral reasoning have been found not only to achieve different stations in life but also to have considerably different values and strategies by which they conduct their lives. The nature of individuals' life outcomes was measured in this study using the status of the person's job as well as both structured and open-ended questions dealing with attitudes toward job, marriage and parenting. It was concluded that persons at higher stages of moral development are more likely to hold higher-status jobs, but there is no evidence that they are more satisfied with them. In the realm of life attitudes, higher-stage men used discussion as a socialization technique in childrearing and valued independence in their children. One feature distinguishing the thinking of these individuals is the ability to see a situation from the perspective of another. This was most evident in their method of resolving marital conflict through role-taking. (BN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MORAL DEVELOPMENT AND LIFE OUTCOMES

Daniel Candee
Richard Graham
Lawrence Kohlberg

Harvard University

NIE GRANT # NIE-G-74-0096

Submitted to the National Institute of Education

June, 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

0013095

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

The nature of moral reasoning 1
Life outcomes 4
Hypotheses. 7
Samples 8
Instruments 11

CHAPTER II: RESULTS OF STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE

Combined Sample
Moral reasoning, job status and other demographic variables. 14

Kohlberg Sample
Job qualities and responsibilities 17
Adolescent moral reasoning and motives 18

OGS Sample
Moral reasoning, cognitive, and demographic variables. . . . 19
Social attitudes and actions 21
Job satisfaction 23
Marital satisfaction, self, and family descriptions. 25
Adolescent qualities 25
Moral socialization. 31
Political behavior 31
Leisure time 31
Summary of OGS attitudes and action. 32

CHAPTER III: RESULTS OF QUALITATIVE REASONING

Job philosophy. 35
Job satisfactions 38
Job dissatisfactions. 39
Moral issues on the job 42
Good father 45
Failed as father. 48
Ideals for children 49
Marital conflict resolution 51
Summary of job and marital philosophy 58

CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY 60

. . . . . .

APPENDIX A: DEFINITION OF MORAL STAGES
APPENDIX B: OAKLAND GROWTH STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
APPENDIX C: SUBSTAGES
APPENDIX D: LIFE OUTCOMES QUESTIONNAIRE

LIST OF TABLES

Page*

Table 1 - Composition of Kohlberg Sample Included in Present Study 9

Table 2 - Composition of 1970 OGS Male Sample 10

Table 3 - Frequency of Job Status by Moral Reasoning in Combined Samples 14

Table 4 - Frequency of Job Status by Moral Reasoning in Kohlberg Sample 14

Table 5 - Frequency of Job Status by Moral Reasoning in OGS Sample 14

Table 6 - Correlations of Moral Reasoning, Demographic and Intellectual Variables in Combined Sample 15

Table 7 - Partial and Part Correlations of Moral Judgment and Job Status Controlling for Education, IQ, Father's Job in Combined Sample 16

Table 8 - Correlations of Moral Reasoning, Intellectual, Demographic, and Job Qualities Variables in Kohlberg Sample 17

Table 9 - Partial and Part Correlations of Moral Judgment and Job Responsibility Controlling for Education, IQ, and Father's Job in Combined Sample 18

Table 10 - Correlations of Moral Reasoning, Intellectual, Demographic and Adolescent Variables in Kohlberg Sample 18

Table 11 - Intercorrelation of Moral Judgment, Demographic and Cognitive Variables - OGS Sample 19

Table 12 - Correlations of Adolescent Cognitive Scores with Adult Measures (OGS Sample) 20

Table 13 - Regression of Moral Judgment, Education and Political Views on Moral Attitude Index (MAI) 21

Table 14 - Regression of Moral Judgment and Percentage of Substage B on Moral Attitude Index (MAI) 22

Table 15 - Regression of Moral Judgment and Stage-Substage Interaction (MJB) on Moral Attitude Index (MAI) 22

*Page numbers listed here include some tables which immediately follow on a separate page and have the same page number as the page of text which precedes them.

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

Page

Table 16 - Correlations of Moral Reasoning and Measure of Job Satisfaction 23

Table 17 - Correlations of Moral Reasoning and Job Satisfcation, Controlling for Job Status 23

Table 18 - Correlations of Moral Reasoning and Self and Family Descriptions 26

Table 19 - Correlations of Moral Reasoning and Relative Importance of Adolescent Qualities 27

Table 20 - Correlations between Moral Reasoning and Moral Socialization Techniques 28

Table 21 - Correlations of Moral Reasoning with Frequency and Response to Children's Moral Questioning 29

Table 22 - Correlations of Moral Reasoning with Preferred Types of Arguments for Discussion with Children 30

Table 23 - Correlations between Moral Judgment, Political Activities, and Political Views 31

Table 24 - Correlations of Moral Reasoning and Leisure Time Activities 31

Table 25 - Brief Definitions of Job Philosophies 36

Table 26 - Job Philosophy Frequencies 37

Table 27 - Job Satisfaction Brief Descriptions 38

Table 28 - Distribution of Job Satisfaction Categories by Moral Reasoning 39

Table 29 - Brief Descriptions of Dissatisfactions 40

Table 30 - Distribution of Job Dissatisfactions by Moral Reasoning 42

Table 31 - Coding Categories for Moral Issues at Work 43

Table 32 - Distribution of Moral Issues on Job by Moral Stage 44

Table 33 - Brief Descriptions 44

Table 34 - Distribution of Contribution to Society Categories by Moral Reasoning 44

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

Page

Table 35 - Brief Descriptions of Good Father Characteristics 46

Table 36 - Frequencies of Good Father Philosophies by Moral Reasoning 47

Table 37 - Brief Descriptions of Ideals for Children 49

Table 38 - Distribution of Ideals for Children by Moral Reasoning 51

Table 39 - Conflict with Wife: Brief Description of Style of Discussion 52

Table 40 - Conflict with Wife: Brief Description of Type of Solution 53

Table 41 - Relationship of Conflict Resolution Process Dimensions to Moral Reasoning 54

Table 42 - Coding Form: Conflict with Wife 55

Table 43 - Frequency of Conflict with Wife Categories by Moral Reasoning 57

Table 44 - Summary of Life Outcome Interview Coding Categories 58

Table 45 - Frequency of Job Status by Moral Reasoning in Kohlberg Sample 62

CHAPTER I

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

In recent years an emphasis has been placed on moral education unequalled since the early part of this century (Kohlberg 1975). It has been shown (Colby, Kohlberg, Speicher, and Lieberman 1977) that sustained participation in moral discussions can significantly increase the rate at which the moral reasoning of students develops. Shortly after the first moral discussion studies were completed a number of "just community" high schools and prisons were begun (Kohlberg, Scharf, and Hickey 1973; Wasserman 1976), focusing on issues of justice and on the interdependent welfare of the community members.

While such efforts seem desirable on the basis of moral philosophy and psychological research, we have had, until now, very little idea about the ultimate consequences of such programs. If, as expected, the graduates of moral education do achieve stages of fuller moral development, what kinds of lives are they likely to lead? Of course, it is too soon to follow the long-range effects on students exposed to moral education in the last five years. However, we can study the life correlates of moral development among middle-aged persons who have, naturally, achieved the type of reasoning towards which moral education aims. An analysis of their lives should serve to broaden our understanding of the effects of moral development in the development of one's life more generally.

The Nature of Moral Reasoning

We shall begin our discussion of moral reasoning by first considering the scope of the moral realm. Morality can be seen as the fair distribution of goods, services, and emotions among people. The most interesting moral situations are those in which the claims to such distributions conflict. The reasoning used to resolve such moral dilemmas involves two aspects, structure and content. Our work in this area (Kohlberg 1969, 1971)

has not been primarily concerned with the content of moral choices but with the reasoning or structure underlying such choices. By "structure" we mean the types of considerations a person uses in resolving moral problems and the principles or logic by which these considerations are tied together.

In order to measure the structure of one's moral reasoning, an individual is presented with a series of situations in which conventional values conflict. A typical story involves a husband Heinz who, after all reasonable and legal offers have failed, must decide whether to steal a drug to save his dying wife. An appeal to conventional folkways cannot resolve this dilemma. We are taught, "Thou shalt not kill," but we also learn, "Thou shalt not steal." An individual is forced not only to examine his or reasons for accepting such values but more importantly to think about the relationship of life to law in this situation, and in general.

By following the responses of the same individuals over a period of years and in several cultures, it has been shown that the structure of moral reasoning develops through a series of six stages. The stages are of increasing complexity; each builds upon and further expands the reasoning of the stage before.

The first two stages are characteristic of children between 6 and 14 years of age. Here, "right" is not yet separated from "pragmatic." At stage 1, right is whatever avoids punishment; at stage 2, it becomes the satisfaction of the needs and desires of oneself and occasionally those of others.

By the third stage, typically reached during high school, an individual has differentiated "right" from "practical." However, right and wrong are determined by what one's parents, the community, or any other moral authority deem a good boy or good girl should do. Psychologically, stage 3 reasoning

is directed at maintaining interpersonal relationships and caters to the emotions of the concerned parties.

The progression to stage 4 is marked by the awareness that individual relationships are part of a larger society. Roles become structured with definite duties and privileges. The overriding concern in stage 4 is to maintain a system which allows the society to function smoothly and avoids chaos. Such a system need not be conventional society; it may be an"ideal" system, humanistic, religious, or communal. But if the system itself is seen as more basic than the rights of its individual members, it is being viewed from a stage 4 perspective.

While stage 4 achieved the awareness of a social system, stages 5 and 6 proceed to ask, "What is the moral validity of that system?" At these higher stages the response is in terms of those features which every human being desires to maximize: physical life and liberty. Liberty, the ability to make one's own decisions and to pursue one's inclinations, necessarily includes the freedoms of speech, assembly, and action. From the moral viewpoint such rights are basic to human beings and exist prior to societies. As a procedural matter these rights must be adjusted when they conflict with the equal valid assertion of such rights by another. However, any action which purports to support a law or maintain a system at the expense of individual rights would be logically and thus morally incorrect, since the very legitimacy of the system is the maximization of such rights. A summary of the moral stages is presented in Appendix A.

While the sequence of moral stages is invariant (no one skips stages), not everyone achieves full development. Individuals may stop developing at any point in the sequence. The rate at which one develops seems to be governed by the degree to which one's daily environment provides both moral

has not been primarily concerned with the content of moral choices but with the reasoning or structure underlying such choices. By "structure" we mean the types of considerations a person uses in resolving moral problems and the principles or logic by which these considerations are tied together.

In order to measure the structure of one's moral reasoning, an individual is presented with a series of situations in which conventional values conflict. A typical story involves a husband Heinz who, after all reasonable and legal offers have failed, must decide whether to steal a drug to save his dying wife. An appeal to conventional folkways cannot resolve this dilemma. We are taught, "Thou shalt not kill," but we also learn, "Thou shalt not steal." An individual is forced not only to examine his or reasons for accepting such values but more importantly to think about the relationship of life to law in this situation, and in general.

By following the responses of the same individuals over a period of years and in several cultures, it has been shown that the structure of moral reasoning develops through a series of six stages. The stages are of increasing complexity; each builds upon and further expands the reasoning of the stage before.

The first two stages are characteristic of children between 6 and 14 years of age. Here, "right" is not yet separated from "pragmatic." At stage 1, right is whatever avoids punishment; at stage 2, it becomes the satisfaction of the needs and desires of oneself and occasionally those of others.

By the third stage, typically reached during high school, an individual has differentiated "right" from "practical." However, right and wrong are determined by what one's parents, the community, or any other moral authority deem a good boy or good girl should do. Psychologically, stage 3 reasoning

common variance to this factor, is typical. Also typical, is Creager and Harding's finding that the remaining "non-halo" variance can be distributed across three orthogonal factors: Social Relations, Administrative Skills, and Technical Knowledge. Since at least the first two of these areas requires moral decision making, we have reason to believe that the development of an individual's moral reasoning may play an important role in the type of job he or she attains and successfully performs.

Other evidence of the importance of moral reasoning to competent job performance can be seen in the series of studies conducted by Price and his colleagues (Price, Taylor, Nelson, Lewis, Loughmiller, Mathiesen, Murray, & Maxwell, 1971) which investigaged the predictors of physician performance. In one of their larger efforts Price et al. asked 1,600 persons connected with the medical profession to list the qualities characterizing good and poor physicians. Out of 80 qualities the three that best distinguished poor physicians were ethical failings. They were, (1) negligence in handling patients (e.g., use of drugs without proper diagnosis), (2) being summoned frequently before monitoring committees for such infractions as malpractice, unnecessary surgery and excessive infection, and (3) deviousness, dishonesty, and deception. The Price et al findings suggest that, at least among physicians, the major reason for job failure is not lack of knowledge or lack of skill but rather an insensitivity to the welfare of others and a sense of irresponsibility.

To date, there has been only one study which specifically investigated the role of moral reasoning in relation to job performance. Cook, Sheehan, Bargin, Husted, Kasey, and Candee (1976) conducted a study of faculty rated job performance among young physicians. Their results showed that moral reasoning was substantially (r=.47) related to overall performance as well as to the subtraits of compassion, personability, relates well with patients, and good clinical judgment.

In regard to the prediction of job status, the most comprehensive study of demographic and intellectual factors was done by Jencks (1972). In reviewing data from a large number of studies, Jencks found that occupational status was typically associated with an individual's years of education ($r = .65$), achievement (or so-called "cognitive") tests ($r = .50$) and with father's SES ($r = .50$). While length of education is clearly the single most important determinant of one's first job, its effect diminishes with time. There is substantially no correlation ($r = .16$) between education and income (one reflection of cumulative promotions) among persons practicing the same occupation. Even this small correlation lessens with number of years on the job. In short, while credentials may secure a first job, performance secures subsequent ones.

If demographic and intellectual factors do not account for success in actual job performance, what does? Jencks (1972, p. 131) expects that at least part of the explanation will come from so-called non-cognitive traits,[1] though he cites inadequacies of measurement for their poor showing until now.

Considering the data just reviewed, we can look at the expected relationship of moral reasoning to job status and job performance in two lights. To the extent that moral reasoning is a "cognitive" trait (i.e., a measure of the complexity with which one reasons about the socio-moral world), we would expect it to predict job status at least as well as such other cognitive measures as IQ and standardized achievement tests. However, to the same extent we would also expect moral reasoning to be related to other cognitive determinants, namely social class background, childhood IQ, and most importantly education.

---

[1] The cognitive, non-cognitive designation is a widely used misnomer. All measures of thoughts, attitudes, and feelings are "cognitive." However, the non-cognitive designation is often used inappropriately when referring to personality traits.

On the other hand, moral reasoning should also be related to job performance. One variable which measures the cumulative effects of both initial job status and subsequent job performance is an individual's mid-career job status. In most cases, the status of a person's mid-career job is the result of the status of his initial job and subsequent promotions for successful performance. Since moral reasoning can be expected to correlate with each of the antecedent variables, we may also expect it to correlate with the resultant variable.

Hypothesis. Therefore, in a sample of adult men, we hypothesize a significant correlation between moral reasoning and the status of their mid-career roles where status is measured by Hollingshead's scale (Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958).

Furthermore, we also expect the moral reasoning of all persons in Hollingshead's highest job class to contain at least some (25% or more of total) Stage 4 thought. The reason for these hypotheses is that all high status jobs (e.g., doctor, lawyer, college professor, big business executive) require the individual to make autonomous decisions which have great impact on the lives of others. It seems unlikely that an individual could survive in a position which requires an understanding of how organizations work, and where the effects of one's decisions on the lives of many interdependent persons must be calculated, without having achieved at least, to some degree, the fourth stage of moral reasoning (the stage of system maintenance). While lesser status jobs, such as a manual worker, many also involve responsibility as measured by the potential consequences of decisions, such jobs do not require the independent decision-making ability and overall planning that higher status occupations do. For this reason we do not expect to find any Stage 5 subjects among the three lesser job categories. Those persons who have developed to Stage 5 and who see the universal moral principles embodied in all social action, will probably be motivated to secure positions of great responsibility and influence so that they may have a direct hand in promoting justice.

While we have hypothesized a direct relationship between job status and moral reasoning, we have said nothing of the effect of other demographic and intellectual variables. Given Jencks' argument, cited earlier, that education is the largest determinant of job status

we must remain hesitant to predict that the moral reasoning-job status relationship will be independent of education, IQ, and social background. Such relationships will, however, be investigated. The only true test of Jencks' hypothesis would require a systematic study of moral reasoning within a single occupation.

Samples

The data for the present study was collected from two independent samples. One is a sample of 50 men, equally divided between those of middle and working-class background, who have been studied since 1955 by Lawrence Kohlberg. The other source consists of 70 men who comprise the adult male portion of the Oakland Growth Study (OGS). While the adults in the OGS have been interviewed periodically since 1930, we are concerned only with the 1970 interviews.

Kohlberg Sample. The Kohlberg sample originally consisted of 72 students selected from two Chicago suburbs. The group was equally divided among three age groups (10, 13, and 16 years of age), family social class (middle- and working-class), and sociometric popularity (Moreno's 1944 measure of isolates and stars). These subjects have been interviewed every three years using Kohlberg's moral judgment interview. Occasionally, other measures including: IQ, ego development, ideal occupation, and Piagetian stage, have also been used. In the latest round of interviews (1976) a special life outcomes questionnaire was added (Appendix B). Due to subject drop-out not all of the original subjects were currently accessible. For present

purposes we analyzed data from all subjects who were last interviewed after the age of 24. Table 1 presents the composition of the current sample. Of this group, 29 were last interviewed in 1976, 23 in 1972, and 3 in 1968. As row 1 of Table 1 reveals, the composition of the present sample is almost equally weighted between subjects of high and low social class background and sociometric rating, as was the Kohlberg original group.

Table 1

COMPOSITION OF KOHLBERG SAMPLE

INCLUDED IN PRESENT STUDY

	Age					SES Background		Sociometric Popularity	
	24-25	26-28	29-31	32-34	35-37	Middle	Working	Star	Isolate
N Total(=55)	5	8	13	17	11	26	29	28[1]	22

	MEANS					
	Job Status	Ed	Father's Job	IQ	Age	Moral Reasoning
Total N=55	3.4	15.3	3.9	107	31.1	355

Note: Job status, father's job status measured on 7-point Hollingshead scale (1=high), education, age in years, SES on Hollingshead scale (1=highest, 7=lowest), IQ on Kuhler-Anderson test, moral development in moral maturity points (300=stage 3, 400=stage 4, etc.).

[1]For five Ss sociometric popularity was not recorded.

OGS Sample. The OGS sample originally consisted of 212 5th grade children at five elementary schools who expected to attend the University of California High School and whose parents planned to remain in the Oakland area for seven years. The initial sample was first interviewed in 1932. However, since that time some subjects have dropped out primarily due to migration from California. In those cases, travel expenses have generally prohibited continued contact. The remaining adults, most of whom were administered moral judgment interviews in 1970, consisted of 88 men and 87 women. However, since 60% of the women did not work and since the Kohlberg sample contained only men, it was decided to analyze male data exclusively in the OGS sample. The composition of the OGS men is presented in Table 2:

Table 2

COMPOSITION OF 1970 OGS MALE SAMPLE

	Job Status	Educ.	SES	Father's Job	IQ	Age	Moral Devel.	
Mean	2.23	16.2	25.4	3.27	124	48.5	363	N=66-78

Note: Job status, father's job status measured on 7-point Hollingshead scale (1-high), education, age in years, SES on Hollingshead scale (1=highest, 7=lowest), IQ on WAIS test, Moral development in moral maturity points (300=stage 3, 400=stage 4, etc.).

In comparison with the Kohlberg sample, the current participants in the OGS survey are clearly skewed in the direction of higher job status, education, and IQ. While the mean moral development scores are not as discrepant as are the other variables, the range is narrowed. In the Kohlberg sample, 23% of the subjects showed some reasoning that was either

above stage 4 or below stage 3. In the OGS sample the comparable figure was only 7%. The most likely explanation for the restricted range in the OGS sample is that the moral judgment interviews were inadequately probed. Thus, extreme subjects (stages 5 or 2) did not have the opportunity to exhibit their more unusual reasoning. Together, the restricted range of moral reasoning and job status variables has the effect of reducing the possible magnitude of the correlations in which they are involved. Therefore, any correlations that do exist in the OGS data are likely to be more attenuated than if we were to sample the entire spectrum of job classes and moral judgment stages.

Instruments

1. Moral Judgment Interview. The moral judgment interview is a semi-structured instrument which presents the subject with a series of moral dilemmas, i.e., situations in which two conventional values conflict. The entire 30-minute interview, consisting of the initial stories and series of probing questions, is transcribed and scored according to Kohlberg's stages of moral development. Interjudge reliability using the standard scoring manual is more than 90%. (Kohlberg, Colby, Gibbs, Speicher-Dubin, Power, and Candee, 1977). A sample story and description of each stage appears in Appendix A.

2. Substages. In addition to major stage, total protocol scores can, due to a recent addition to the scoring system, also be distinguished by substage. Substages reflect the degree to which moral judgments at each stage are made mutual (i.e., apply equally to all parties in the situation) and the degree to which they describe ideal or improved relationships. A complete description of the substage schema appears in Appendix C.

The use of substages in this study will be the first application of the construct to a large body of demographic and attitudinal data. Since substages are based on the same formal criteria which define the sequence of major stages, it seems likely that any variable which is related to the stages of moral reasoning would be even more strongly related to the interaction of stage and substage. In order to test this proposition, a single stage-by-substage variable was defined. This variable (MJB) is dichotomous and includes, on one hand, only those subjects whose moral reasoning is both at stage 4(3) and above and also substage B, and on the other hand, only those subjects whose reasoning is stage 3(4) and below and whose substage is A. Where appropriate, tables involving moral reasoning will present the relationship of variables to stage, substage (percent B), and to the stage-by-substage interaction (MJB).

3. Job status. Job status was measured by Hollingshead's (1958) Index.

4. Job qualities and responsibility. In addition to classifying jobs by their status we also classified them by their job qualities, and their responsibility requirements. Job qualities were determined on the basis of the U.S. Labor Department's Dictionary of Occupational Titles (1965). Each job is coded by a six-digit number, the last three digits of which indicate the requirements of that job in relation to data, people, and things. Nine gradations are found within each area as follows:

DATA (4th digit)	PEOPLE (5th digit)	THINGS (6th digit)
9 Synthesizing	9 Mentoring	9 Setting-Up
8 Coordinating	8 Negotiating	8 Precision Working
7 Analyzing	7 Instructing	7 Operating-Controlling
6 Compiling	6 Supervising	6 Driving-Operating
5 Computing	5 Diverting	5 Manipulating
4 Copying	4 Persuading	4 Tending
3 Comparing	3 Speaking-Signaling	3 Feeding-Offbearing
2, 1 No significant relationship	2 Serving	2 Handling
	1 No significant relationship	1 No significant relationship

Implicit within each set of categories is a dimension of simplicity to complexity.

The degree of responsibility required by each job in the Kohlberg sample was rated by two judges on a 10-point scale, using the following definition:

> A job is considered highly responsible if failure to satisfactorily perform the duties of the job will result in serious harm to others. Furthermore, the individual holding such a job must not be able to easily rely on others to perform his duties if he or she fails.

The correlation between responsibility ratings of the two judges was .85.

5. Intelligence. Intelligence was measured by the Wescheler-Bellveau Adult Intelligence test administered in 1970 to subjects in the OGS sample. Intelligence was measured by the Kuhler-Anderson Test administered to subjects in the Kohlberg sample at the time of their first interview and to the original OGS subjects in 1934 during junior high school.

6. Sociometric popularity. Sociometric peer ratings were obtained for Kohlberg subjects at the time of their first interview using the method of Moreno (1944).

7. Need for achievement, affiliation, and power. These motives were measured using the scoring system of Atkinson (1958) for Kohlberg subjects at the time of the 1964 interview.

CHAPTER II

RESULTS OF STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE

Combined sample

Moral reasoning, job status and other demographic variables. The main hypotheses of this study concerned the relationship between moral reasoning (also referred to as moral judgment) and job status. In a combined sample of all subjects (N=122) a correlation of $r = .52$, $p < .01$, was found between the two variables. A more descriptive picture of this relationship is presented in Table 3. As predicted, nearly all of the subjects (91%) whose moral reasoning contained some stage 5 thought had achieved jobs in status categories 1 and 2. Also as predicted, at least some degree of stage 4 thought actually seems to be required for the performance of high status jobs. As shown in Table 3, 93% of all subjects in job status categories 1 and 2 had moral reasoning that was stage 3(4) or above.

However, a more detailed look at the moral reasoning-job status relationship within each of the samples reveals two somewhat different patterns. The magnitude of the relationship in the Kohlberg sample was r=.63, while in the OGS sample, it was r=.45. Within the Kohlberg sample (Table 4) no subject held a job in status category 1 whose moral reasoning was below stage 4. However, in the OGS sample (Table 5) we find that a full 59% of all subjects in job status category 1 had moral reasoning below stage 4. Thus, the question of whether jobs of the highest status are associated with solid stage 4 thought or only with the partial presence of stage 4 thought, i.e., stages 3(4) and 4(3), is answered differently in each sample. As stated earlier, it is our belief that the data regarding moral reasoning is more accurate in the Kohlberg sample because the interviews were more thoroughly conducted. However, the discrepancy in the two samples may also stem from from the fact that subjects in the OGS sample are 17 years older than those in the Kohlberg group. As Jencks (1972) has found, the

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY OF JOB STATUS BY MORAL REASONING

IN COMBINED SAMPLES

Job Status	Moral Stage									Row Totals
	2(3)	3(2)	3	3(4)	4(3)	4	4(5)	5(4)	5	
1. Big Business Executive, Major Professional			3 (13%)	5 (24%)	11 (31%)	14 (56%)	3 (75%)	3 (50%)	1 (100%)	40 (33%)
2. Medium Business Executive, Lesser Professional				3 (14%)	8 (23%)	5 (20%)	1 (25%)	2 (33%)		20 (16%)
3. Small Business, Minor Professional	1 (100%)		8 (33%)	8 (38%)	8 (23%)	4 (16%)				29 (24%)
4. Little Business, Clerk, Salesman		2 (40%)	1 (4%)		4 (11%)	1 (4%)		1 (17%)		9 (7%)
5. Skilled Manual			9 (38%)	5 (24%)	2 (6%)	1 (4%)				17 (14%)
6. Semi-Skilled Manual		3 (60%)	3 (13%)		2 (6%)					8 (7%)
Column Total Percent	1 (1%)	5 (4%)	24 (20%)	21 (17%)	35 (29%)	25 (20%)	4 (3%)	6 (5%)	1 (1%)	TOTAL N=122 (100%)

Note: All entries are frequencies and column percentages.

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY OF JOB STATUS BY MORAL REASONING

IN KOHLBERG SAMPLE

Job Status	Moral Stage								Row Totals
	2(3)	3(2)	[illegible]	3(4)	4(3)	4	4(5)	5(4)	
1. Big Business Executive, Major Profess-ional						4 (36%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	8 (15%)
2. Medium Business Executive, Lesser Profess-ional				2 (20%)	3 (30%)	2 (18%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	10 (18%)
3. Small Business, Minor Profess-ional	1 (100%)		3 (23%)	6 (60%)	2 (25%)	4 (36%)			16 (29%)
4. Little Business, Clerk, Salesman		1 (25%)	1 (8%)		1 (13%)			1 (25%)	4 (7%)
5. Skilled Manual			6 (46%)	2 (20%)		1 (9%)			9 (16%)
6. Semi-Skilled Manual		3 (75%)	3 (23%)		2 (25%)				8 (15%)
Column Total Percent	1 (2%)	4 (7%)	13 (24%)	10 (18%)	8 (15%)	11 (20%)	4 (7%)	4 (7%)	TOTAL N= 55 (100%)

Note: Cell entries are frequencies and column percentages.

TABLE 5

FREQUENCY OF JOB STATUS BY MORAL REASONING

IN OGS SAMPLE

Job Status	Moral Stage									Row Totals
	2(3)	3(2)	3	3(4)	4(3)	4	4(5)	5(4)	5	
1. Big Business Executive, Major Profess-ional			3 (27%)	5 (50%)	11 (41%)	10 (71%)		2 (100%)	1 (100%)	32 (49%)
2. Medium Business Executive, Lesser Profess-ional					5 (19%)	3 (21%)				8 (12%)
3. Small Business, Minor Profess-ional			5 (46%)	2 (20%)	6 (22%)					13 (20%)
4. Little Business, Clerk, Salesman		1 (100%)			3 (11%)	1 (7%)				5 (8%)
5. Skilled Manual			3 (27%)	3 (30%)	2 (7%)					8 (12%)
6. Semi-Skilled Manual										0 (0%)
Column Total Column %age	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	11 (17%)	11 (15%)	27 (41%)	14 (21%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	TOTAL N=67 (100%)

Note: Cell entries are frequencies and column percentages.

correlation of job status and cognitive test scores is consistently greater in younger men (see p. 6 of this report).

The intercorrelations of other demographic and intellectual variables which were measured in both studies are presented in Table 6. As Table 6 shows, not only is moral reasoning related to job status, but it is also related to IQ, education, and father's job status. The magnitude of these figures is consistent with other studies of this area (reviewed in Kohlberg 1969).

The high intercorrelations in Table 6 lead us to ask whether the relationship of moral reasoning to job status is direct or whether it is an artifact of other relationships. In order to answer this question, we conducted a series of regressions measuring the correlation between moral reasoning and job status with the effect of other variables controlled.

TABLE 6

CORRELATIONS OF MORAL REASONING, DEMOGRAPHIC AND INTELLECTUAL VARIABLES IN COMBINED SAMPLE

	Moral Reasoning	Job Status[1]	Education	Father's Job[1]
Moral Reasoning	---			
Job Status	.52	---		
Education	.59	.62	---	
Father's Job	.36	.49	.42	---
IQ	.38	.64	.34	.36

Note: N=122. All correlations significant at $p < .001$.

[1]Direction of scale changed from Tables 1-5. Here Big Business Executive = 6, Semi-Skilled Labor = 1.

As shown in Table 7, moral judgment remains a significant predictor of job status after the effects of education, IQ, and father's job are individually removed (see partial and part correlations).[1] However, moral judgment is not a significant addition to a model which already contains both education and IQ, or one which contains education, IQ, and father's job (see last two columns of Table 7). Indeed, since the three-variable model (education, IQ, and father's job) has a multiple correlation of .78 with job status, there is relatively little variance left to be explained by any additional factor, including moral judgment.

Does this mean that moral judgment plays no role in the achievement of job status? We have already seen that strong zero-order and first-order partial correlations between moral judgment and job status exist. Furthermore, at least in the Kohlberg sample, high status jobs seemed to require stage 4 and 5 thinking and virtually all stage 5 persons held prestigious jobs. While education and IQ together can account for all of the variance in job status due to moral judgment, it does not mean that education and IQ <u>are</u> moral judgment. The interpretation favored here is that much of the effect of education and intelligence is actually through moral reasoning. Intelligence coupled with years of schooling are exactly the conditions which are most

---

[1] The difference between the partial and part correlations is that in the case of the partial correlation the variance due to each controlling variable (e.g., education) or set of variables is removed from <u>both</u> moral judgment and job status, while in the case of the part correlation it is removed from moral judgment alone. The partial correlation squared (not included in Table 7) refers to the proportion of variance in job status left unexplained by each predictor variable (e.g., education) or set of variables that can subsequently be explained by moral judgment. The part correlation squared (identical with R square change) is the absolute increase in job status variance that is explained by moral judgment beyond that already attributed to each predictor or predictor set. As shown in Table 7, the conclusions drawn in this study are the same based on either variable. However, the logic of the text calls for reference to sometimes one and sometimes the other of these statistics.

TABLE 7

PARTIAL AND PART CORRELATIONS OF MORAL JUDGMENT AND JOB STATUS CONTROLLING FOR EDUCATION, IQ, FATHER'S JOB IN COMBINED SAMPLE

Control Variables				
Education	IQ	Father's Job	Education, IQ	Education, IQ, Father's Job
PARTIAL CORRELATIONS				
.24*	.39*	.42*	.13	.11
PART CORRELATIONS				
.19†	.30*	.37*	.08	.07

Note: N (minimum) = 113. Multiple R of Ed, IQ, F Job with job status = .78. Multiple R of Ed, IQ, F Job, MJ with job status = .78. (R^2 change = .00, n.s.)

*$p < .01$

†$p < .05$

likely to result in the development of moral thought. It seems reasonable to expect that it is moral reasoning (i.e., a socio-moral strategy) that is directly called upon, at least in part, by individuals in the pursuance of their occupations. In statistically controlling for education and IQ we conservatively, but unrealistically, attributed all of the variance in job status held in common by education, IQ, and moral judgment to education and IQ exclusively.[2]

Kohlberg Sample

The results in the next section are based on subjects in the Kohlberg sample only.

Job qualities and responsibilities. The relationship of predictor variables (e.g., moral reasoning, education, IQ and father's job) to job responsibility is similar to the associations found between those variables and job status. (Table 8) Indeed, our original equation of job status with job responsibility seems justified. The responsibility ratings of jobs correlated .72 with the status of those jobs. Table 8 also reveals some of the components upon which job status and job responsibility are based. Looking at the three columns on job qualities, we find that both job status

[2]Before leaving the present topic we should note the influence of holding a college degree per se on the moral reasoning-job status relationship. Among the subsample of college graduates there was almost no correlation between moral reasoning and job status (r=.17). Nearly all college graduates held higher status jobs. However, among those subjects who did not graduate from college, a correlation of r=.43, $p < .01$, between moral reasoning and job status was found. Furthermore, removing the remaining variance between education and moral reasoning does not appreciably lower the correlation. This suggests that the area where moral education programs have the greatest potential to be effective is among those students who will not go on to college. However, the strongest predictor of high job status among the non-college graduates is IQ. Indeed, it appears that all of the variance in the moral judgment-job status relationship stems from the common association of these two variables with intelligence (see partial correlations). Thus, while moral education programs are most likely to be successful in securing good jobs for those non-college graduates who are intelligent, they and other interventions appear to be most needed by those who are of lesser intelligence.

TABLE 8

CORRELATIONS OF MORAL REASONING, INTELLECTUAL,

DEMOGRAPHIC, AND JOB QUALITIES VARIABLES

IN KOHLBERG SAMPLE

	Moral Reasoning	Job Status	Education	IQ	Father's Job	Job Responsibility	Job Data	Job People
Moral Reasoning	---							
Job Status	.63	---						
Education	.71	.79	---					
IQ	.52	.57	.51	---				
Father's Job	.48	.51	.56	.18	---			
Job Responsibility	.46	.72	.58	.37	.35	---		
Job Data	.38	.79	.44	.55	.31	.59	---	
Job People	.39	.64	.60	.29	.34	.62	.47	---
Job Things	-.37	-.46	-.49	-.18	-.07	-.36	-.27	-.58

Note: N=54. Job status, Father's Job scored Big Business Executive = 6, Semi-Skilled = 1. All correlations greater than r=.24, are significant at $p < .05$.

and job responsibility are effectively composed of complexity in dealing with people and data and negatively composed of complexity in dealing with things.

As was the case with job status, moral reasoning significantly predicts job responsibility when IQ and father's job are individually controlled but does not predict job responsibility when IQ and father's job, along with education, are simultaneously controlled. (Table 9)

Adolescent moral reasoning and motives. In addition to the variables already discussed, data concerning the following measures were also available for at least part of the Kohlberg group: moral reasoning at age 17 (cited as adolescent moral reasoning), sociometric popularity at time of first interview, and need for achievement, affiliation, and power measured at age 17. Of particular interest in Table 10 are the correlations involving adolescent moral reasoning. While moral reasoning at age 17 was an excellent predictor of moral reasoning at age 30, it was a very poor predictor of future job status. A case-by-case analysis of the original data reveals that those individuals who were advanced in their adolescent moral reasoning continued to develop ahead of their peers and eventually achieved both higher moral reasoning and high status jobs. However, among the many subjects who had only average or below average adolescent moral thought, those who showed the greatest moral development in the ensuing years were the ones who also went on to enter the most prestigious adult occupations.

TABLE 9

PARTIAL AND PART CORRELATIONS OF MORAL JUDGMENT AND JOB RESPONSIBILITY CONTROLLING FOR EDUCATION, IQ, AND FATHER'S JOB IN COMBINED SAMPLE

Control Variables				
Education	IQ	Father's Job	Education, IQ	Education, IQ, Father's Job
Partial Correlations				
.17	.36**	.37**	.12	.11
Part Correlations				
.13	.33**	.34**	.10	.09

N = 47

** $p < .01$

TABLE 10

CORRELATIONS OF MORAL REASONING, INTELLECTUAL, DEMOGRAPHIC

AND ADOLESCENT VARIABLES IN KOHLBERG SAMPLE

	Adult Moral Reasoning	Job Status	Education	IQ	Father's Job	Adolescent Moral Reasoning	Popularity	n Achievement	n Affiliation	n Power
Adult Moral Reasoning	---									
Job Status	.63**	---								
Education	.71**	.79**	---							
IQ	.52**	.57**	.51**	---						
Father's Job	.48**	.51**	.56**	.18	---					
Adolescent Moral Reasoning	.65**	.15	.32*	.36*	.34*	---				
Popularity	.14	.03	.03	.29*	.03	.32*	---			
n Achievement	.20	.23	.19	.21	.38*	.39*	.47*	---		
n Affiliation	.24	.10	.24	.02	.22	.36*	.10	.12	---	
n Power	.24	.20	.18	.31	.28	.09	.03	.27	.07	---

Note: N = Adult moral, job status (55); education, IQ, father's job (52); adolescent moral (36); popularity (50); n ach, n affil, n power (26).

* p .05

** p .01

In the area of sociometric status, Table 10 reveals that those adolescents most favored by their peers were those who were intelligent, achievement-oriented, and advanced in their moral thinking (see correlations of sociometric status with IQ, and n ach). Thus, our study supports the finding of Selman (1976) and others that being moral, among adolescents, actually seems to enhance popularity. However, popularity in high school was unrelated to any adult measures (job status, education, and adult moral reasoning).

OGS Sample

Moral reasoning, cognitive and demographic variables. We turn now to the intercorrelations of moral reasoning, cognitive, and demographic variables within the OGS sample (Table 11). In comparison with the Kohlberg sample (Table 10) and the combined sample (Table 6), we find the correlations between moral reasoning and job status, IQ, and education to be somewhat lower. As we suggested earlier, this may be due to either the poorer quality of the moral judgment interviews in the OGS sample or the older age of those subjects. Of particular interest in Table 11 (OGS sample) is the fact that both moral reasoning and education were more strongly related to maternal rather than paternal factors. This may be due to the unique place held by educated, professional women at the time the OGS subjects were children. Families in the 1930's which contained educated mothers were special, quite likely in the direction of emphasizing intellectual and ethical qualities. It is these families that would be expected to provide the greatest stimulus to cognitive moral development and to intellectual achievement.

TABLE 11

INTERCORRELATION OF MORAL JUDGMENT, DEMOGRAPHIC AND COGNITIVE VARIABLES - OGS SAMPLE

	MJ	IQ	Job	Ed	SES	MEd.	MJob	MSES	FEd	FJob	FSES
Moral Judgment	-										
IQ	.41	-									
Job Status	.45	.58	-								
Education	.53	.44	.58	-							
SES	.49	.60	.96	.72	-						
Mother's Ed.	.33	.38	.30	.49	.38	-					
Mothers's Job	.30	.57	.42	.60	.48	.77	-				
Mother's SES	.32	.48	.38	.61	.46	.91	.95	-			
Father's Ed.	.12	.40	.38	.21	.38	.41	.42	.39	-		
Father's Job	.18	.41	.33	.29	.35	.45	.43	.40	.69	-	
Father's SES	.23	.50	.36	.33	.38	.50	.46	.42	.80	.91	-

Note - N for correlations involving MJ=66, IQ, MEd, FEd=71, Job =78, Ed, SES=76, MJob, MSES=35, FJob=70, FSES=67. All correlations greater than .20 are significant at $p < .05$.

The correlations of a number of cognitive variables measured in the 1930's with adult job and intellectual status are presented in Table 12. As shown in Table 12, the average of school grades in seven subjects and an

TABLE 12

CORRELATIONS OF ADOLESCENT COGNITIVE SCORES WITH ADULT MEASURES (OGS SAMPLE)

	1934 Grades	1934 Achmt	1934 IQ	1970 Job	1970 MJ	1970 IQ
1938 Grades Av.	-					
1938 Ach Test Av	.70	-				
1938 IQ	.67	.92	-			
1970 Job status	.41	.52	.50	-		
1970 Moral Judg.	.30	.37	.24	.46	-	
1970 IQ	.39	.52	.50	.59	.41	-

Note - All 1938 measures N=37. Number of subjects for other measures are MJ (N=66), Job (N=78), IQ (N=71). All correlations above .27 are significant at $p < .05$, based on 37 Ss.

average of achievement tests in those same subjects, gathered during the subjects' junior year of high school (1938), are both excellent predictors of job status 32 years later. The significance of these results is maintained for grade average when 1970 IQ is controlled but not when 1938 IQ is controlled (i.e., when job status and grade average are correlated within high and low IQ groups). The achievement test - job status link loses all significance when either 1938 or 1970 IQ is controlled. However, considering the present data in relation to the small (r=.14) correlation found between high school moral judgment scores and adult job status in the Kohlberg sample, we must conclude

that there is no evidence to support the claim that adolescent moral reasoning is a better predictor of adult job status than are high school grades, achievement tests, or adolescent IQ.

Social Attitudes and Actions in OGS Sample. The next section of results includes a variety of social, political, and familial attitudes and actions which were measured only in the OGS sample. We began our analysis of the attitude and action variables by demonstrating that an overall link with moral judgment did, in fact, exist. Those attitude and action variables which, on the basis of theory, could have been expected to relate to moral reasoning were combined to form a Moral Attitude Index (see starred items in Appendix B). A regression shows that moral reasoning is significantly related to the Moral Attitude Index even after the effects of the two most likely competing variables, education and political views, are eliminated (Table 13).

TABLE 13

REGRESSION OF MORAL JUDGMENT, EDUCATION AND POLITICAL VIEWS ON MORAL ATTITUDE INDEX (MAI)

Variable	Mult R	R^2	R^2change	F	Simple R with MAI
Education	.35	.12	.12*	6.77*	.35
Pol. views[a]	.35	.12	.00	.02	.01
MJ	.50	.25	.13*	2.10*	.50

Note - N=52, df=3/48 for last hypothesis.
[a]See question 1 Appendix A. * p. $<$ .05, only R-square change and F tested.

The relationship of substage to the MAI is more complex. As expected, the measure of substage, which cuts across moral stages, is much less related to the attitudes of the MAI than is a measure of moral stage alone. Thus, a regression which first removes the moral stage effect leaves an insignificant amount of variance to be explained by substage (Table 14). In this sense substage is unnecessary as a predictor of MAI.

TABLE 14

REGRESSION OF MORAL JUDGMENT AND PERCENTAGE OF SUBSTAGE B ON MORAL ATTITUDE INDEX (MAI)

Variable	Mult R	R^2	R^2 change	F	Simple R with MAI
MJ	.50	.25	.25*	18.04*	.50
B	.50	.25	.00	.01	.30

Note: N = 56 df = 2/54 for last hypotheses

*p < .01, only R^2 change and its F tested.

However, in predicting MAI, substage information is quite valuable as a "purifier" of moral stage. We constructed a variable which included only those subjects who were either high in both moral reasoning and substage B (i.e., stage 3(4) or above and greater than 50% B) or low in both measures. This variable (MJB) correlated .57 with the MAI which was significant even after the effects of moral reasoning alone were removed (Table 15). Thus, while substage information seems to repeat much of what is already learned through

TABLE 15

REGRESSION OF MORAL JUDGMENT AND STAGE-SUBSTAGE INTERACTION (MJB) ON MORAL ATTITUDE INDEX (MAI)

Variable	Mult R	R^2	R^2 change	F	Simple R with MAI
MJ	.50	.25	.25**	12.14**	.50
MJB	.58	.33	.08*	4.72*	.58

Note: N = 38 df = 2/36 for last hypotheses

**p < .01, *p < .05, only R^2 change and its F tested.

moral stage (i.e., they correlate .60 with each other), a measure of substage is valuable in more clearly delineating the extremes of moral thought. For this reason we will continue to report data based on the composite MJB variable in the following correlations.

In addition to moral stage and the stage-by-substage interaction, the variables which appear in the succeeding tables will also be correlated by years of education. This is done to allow the reader to compare the effects of moral reasoning on each dependent variable with the most likely competing explanation.

Job Satisfaction. We have already seen that higher stage individuals tend to hold more prestigious jobs. We may now ask, "Are they more satisfied with them?" Three indices of job satisfaction can be found in the OGS data. Question 23 (Appendix B) focused on the dimension of job satisfaction, question 24 referred to job involvement, while question 25 concerned the degree to which an individual's actual job matches his ideal job. The correlation of each of these measures with moral reasoning is presented in Table 16.

TABLE 16

CORRELATIONS OF MORAL REASONING
AND MEASURES OF JOB SATISFACTION

	MJ	MJB	Ed
1. Job Satisfaction	.15	.04	.12
2. Job Involvement	.22*	.10	.28*
3. Job Ideality	.32**	.10	.31*

Note - N=63
* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Overall, moral reasoning seems moderately related to measures of job satisfaction, while MJB does not. However, nearly all of the moral reasoning-job satisfaction relationship is due to the fact that higher stage subjects have more prestigious, and probably more interesting jobs. The relationship between moral reasoning and the three job satisfaction indices controlling for job status is presented in Table 17.

TABLE 17

CORRELATIONS OF MORAL REASONING
AND JOB SATISFACTION, CONTROLLING FOR JOB STATUS

	High Status	Low Status
Job Satisfaction	.11	.11
Job Involvement	.15	.07
Job Ideality	.28*	.10

Note - N=63. Correlations are Kendall's tau. **High status = Hollingshead categories 1-3, low status = 4-7.**
* p .05

Although all correlations are in the expected direction, their magnitude is low and only one is significant. Thus, we can conclude that there is a small but generally non-significant tendency for persons of higher moral stage to be more satisfied in their jobs regardless of job status.

Marital satisfaction, self, and family descriptions. The next set of attitudes we will examine are the subject's descriptions of himself, his wife, and his perception of their feelings towards each other and towards their children. As can be seen in Table 18, there is essentially no correlation between moral and marital satisfaction. This data, together with the findings on job satisfaction (Table 16, p.23), indicates that high stage reasoning per se does not lead to greater happiness at home or on the job.

Returning to Table 18, we find that the most significant correlations did occur in the area of the subject's feelings towards his wife. Higher stage subjects tend to be more affectionate, and accepting in this area than do lower stage subjects. The general magnitude of correlations is amplified by considering substage.

On the other hand, higher and low stage subjects do not differ in their own self-descriptions or in their feelings towards their children. Also, with only one exception, there was no difference between high and low moral reasoners in the traits which they perceive their wives as having towards themselves and towards their children. Thus, we can conclude that the area where moral reasoning has the greatest effect on familial attitudes is in the subject's perception of the husband-wife interaction, a characteristic we will encounter later in discussing the open-ended material in the Kohlberg sample. Also, we should note that only one significant correlation involving education can be found in Table 18. Thus, those familial attitudes which did relate to moral reasoning were not artifactual.

Adolescent qualities. The next area of attitudes investigated in the OGS sample was the choice of qualities deemed important for the character of a teenage boy or girl. The correlation of moral reasoning with the relative importance of such values appears in Table 19.

TABLE 18

CORRELATIONS OF MORAL REASONING AND SELF AND FAMILY DESCRIPTIONS

	MJ	MJB	Ed
Marital Satisfaction	.05	.13	.11
Feelings towards wife			
Affectionate	.26*	.36*	-.23*
Seldom angry	.08	.06	.09
Accepting	.35*	.34*	.17
Open	.16	.30*	-.14
Wife's feelings towards self			
Affectionate	n.s	n.s	n.s.
Seldom angry	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Accepting	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Open	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Wife's feelings towards children			
(Affectionate, seldom angry, accepting, open)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Description of self			
Optimistic, cheerful, warm, outgoing, not worrying	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Description of spouse			
Optimistic. cheerful, warm, outgoing, not worrying	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

N= 56

*$p < .05$

TABLE 19

CORRELATIONS OF MORAL REASONING AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF ADOLESCENT QUALITIES

Adolescent Qualities	For Girls			For Boys		
	MJ	MJB	ED	MJ	MJB	ED
Obedient	-.27*	-.30*	-.12	-.23*	-.31*	-.12
Dependable	-.27*	-.20	.00	-.11	-.21	-.07
Ambitious	-.23*	-.17	.01	-.18	-.14	-.08
Honest	-.20	-.08	-.07	-.12	-.04	-.07
Good Student	-.18	-.30*	-.08	-.17	-.30*	-.09
Defend Self	-.16	-.15	-.18	-.16	-.16	-.20
Considerate	-.16	-.25	.05	.07	.06	-.10
Good Manners	-.14	-.27*	-.20	-.14	-.22	-.28*
Liked by Adults	-.14	-.15	-.25*	-.15	-.15	-.29*
Neat	-.07	.14	-.21	-.14	-.08	-.36*
Affectionate	.00	-.14	-.14	-.28*	-.23	-.22*
Serious	.02	.01	.00	.10	.01	.08
Self-Control	.05	.20	.00	.22	.10	.03
Curious	.12	.23	.19	.21	.25	.12
Popular	.13	.09	.02	.10	.01	.09
Independent	.24*	.30*	.15	.12	.22	.01
N =	(53)	(37)	(59)	(53)	(37)	(59)

*p < .05

An examination of Table 19 reveals that high moral reasoners (MJ and MJB columns) are distinguished by their rejection of conventional values (obedience and studiousness for both girls and boys, having good manners, ambition, and dependability for girls and affection for boys). Only the trait of independence was positively valued (significantly for girls, slightly less so for boys). This pattern is quite consistent with the longstanding observation that as one approaches higher stage reasoning, conventional values are rejected in favor of self-chosen principles (Kohlberg, 1969).

Moral socialization. The next area of investigation involves the techniques used by parents in the moral socialization of their children. Three major techniques: power assertion, induction, and love withdrawal were measured in the OGS questionnaire, based on items created by Hoffman (1964). Shoeffitt (1971),who extended Hoffman's work into the area of cognitive moral development, found that higher stage reasoning was positively correlated with the use of induction ($r=.27$), negatively correlated with the use of love withdrawal ($r=-.36$), and essentially unrelated to the use of power assertion. In order to test these findings, we combined the items listed in Table 20 (see Note at bottom of table) into the dimensions of Hoffman and Shoeffitt. Subjects were asked to indicate their most frequent, most typical, and least typical responses to their children's wrongdoing. Although no pattern appears strongly in all three areas (Table 20), our results generally confirm those of Shoeffitt. As in his study, love withdrawal was reported to be most frequently used as a socialization technique among lower stage subjects. Power assertion was essentially uncorrelated with moral thought, though it was the least typical technique of higher stage B subjects. Finally, while there was no correlation between moral reasoning and the 6-item dimension of indication, the use of "discussion" was, as predicted, most typically found among higher stage persons and least typically among those of lower moral stage.

Several other questions involving transmission of moral values were also asked in the OGS study. One set of these questions elicited the frequency and

TABLE 20

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MORAL REASONING AND MORAL SOCIALIZATION TECHNIQUES

Types of Socialization Techniques	MJ	MJB	ED
Frequency of Use			
Love Withdrawal	-.33**	-.40**	.17
Power Assertion	.00	-.02	.07
Induction	-.04	.05	.11
Discussion	.05	.09	.00
Most Typical			
Love Withdrawal	.00	.21	.02
Power Assertion	.06	.03	-.12
Induction	.02	.04	.01
Discussion	.28*	.22	.16
Least Typical			
Love Withdrawal	.02	.06	.27
Power Assertion	.17	.32*	.20
Induction	-.11	-.12	-.11
Discussion	-.21	.12	.00
N	(52)	(36)	(58)

Note - The composite types consist of the following items: Love Withdrawal (Show how pleased I'd be, Show how angry I'd be, Show how disappointed I'd be). Power Assertion (Stop them). Induction (Tell them of bad things that will happen. Point out the ways others will be affected, Tell them of the examples of good people, Attempt to teach what's right and wrong, Discuss and examine the various aspects of the issue). The last item "discussion" was also examined separately.

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

nature of the subject's response to his children's questioning of right and wrong. Results of these items appear in Table 21.

TABLE 21

CORRELATIONS OF MORAL REASONING WITH FREQUENCY AND RESPONSE TO CHILDREN'S MORAL QUESTIONING

	MJ	MJB	ED
Frequency of children's questioning of right and wrong	.26*	-.03	-.14
Frequency of children's challenging right and wrong	.19	.14	-.07
Frequency of parent changing mind in response to children	.00	.01	-.11
Encouragement by parent of children's questioning	.22	.09	.06
Encouragement by parent of children's challenging	.28*	.23	.39*
N	(52)	(36)	(58)

Note: Responses scored in most frequent and in most encouraging directions.

* $p < .05$

As the results in Table 21 indicate, higher stage subjects more frequently receive questions from their children concerning moral matters and more often encourage their children to challenge parentally held moral attitudes. The effect is due entirely to moral stage not to the stage-substage interaction.

The other area of moral transmission investigated in the OGS study involved the type of reasoning most favored by subjects in discussing moral matters with their children. Six choices were presented, loosely representing each of the six moral stages. Correlations of moral reasoning with the ranked importance of each of the six modes of reasoning are presented in Table 22.

TABLE 22

CORRELATIONS OF MORAL REASONING WITH

PREFERRED TYPES OF ARGUMENTS FOR DISCUSSION WITH CHILDREN

Basis on which children should be encouraged to base their decisions	MJ	MJB	Ed
1. Obedience and punishment avoidance	-.24*	-.32*	-.27*
2. What works best for their own welfare	.16	.05	-.05
3. Natural and kind action of a good person	-.05	-.14	-.08
4. Rules and laws of country	-.34*	-.15	-.17
5. Maintain commitments to others and society	.25*	.19	-.10
6. Rights and needs of persons involved	.18	.34*	.13
N	(49)	(34)	(55)

Note - Positive sign inidcates higher moral reasoning is associated with preference for that type of argument.

As can be seen in Table 22, higher stage reasoners tend to eschew arguments based on obedience (Stage 1) and rules (Stage 4) and to prefer arguments based on commitments to others (Stage 5) and on rights (Stage 6). Since nearly all of our "higher stage" subjects were at Stage 4, the pattern is, in general, consistent with Rest's (1973) finding that persons prefer reasoning one stage beyond their own and most often reject reasoning that is the greatest number of stages below. The present results seem to extend Rest's phenomenon to the realm of preferred approaches to moral childrearing. The exceptions to the overall pattern, particularly the lack of clear rejection by higher stage subjects of statement 2, can probably be explained by the wider connotations of the phrase "own welfare." Had the question used the phrase "self-interest" which more accurately captures the principle of Stage 2, our results may well

have been different.

Moral reasoning and action: political behavior

We turn now to the relationship of moral reasoning to physical behavior. The first such area involves political activity. As indicated in Table 23, there was a .25 correlation between stage of moral development and activity in "political-social organizations or causes." This was attributable primarily to the greater participation of higher stage subjects in financial contributions, letter stuffing, circulating petitions, going on marches, and signing petitions. It should be noted that, despite these significant correlations, the actual frequency of such activities was small (mean frequency for all 11 activities was .09 where 1 indicated participation and 0 no participation). However, the fact that only two of the activities correlated significantly with education suggests that the general cognitive structures associated with political activity are moral and not simply the result of having been socialized into an educated milieu. Furthermore, the effect cannot be due to the ideological nature of the political causes. Unlike several other studies in the area (Fishkin,Keniston, & MacKinnon 1973; Center 1974), the correlation between political views and moral reasoning was essentially zero.

Leisure time. Another area of behavior investigated by the OGS study was the ways in which subjects spend their leisure time. Table 24 presents the relationship between moral reasoning, education and various leisure time activities.

Looking first at the frequency column, we find that persons at higher stages of moral development most often spend their leisure time attending theaters, concerts, professional meetings, and reading. In terms of enjoyment, higher stage subjects also prefer concerts, theater, and professional meetings, along with physical activity, discussion groups, watching movies and TV, and participation in community and political affairs. In sum, higher stage subjects seem

TABLE 23

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MORAL JUDGMENT, POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, AND POLITICAL VIEWS

	MJ	MJB	Ed
1. Political views[a]	-.14	-.08	.0
2. Summary participation[b]	.24*	.20	-.06
Areas of Participation			
3. Financial contributions	.34*	.23	-.08
4. Circulating petitions	.26*	---	.23*
5. Marches	.26*	---	.23*
6. Signing petitions	.24*	.15	.15
7. Precinct work	.19	-.14	.03
8. Committees	.07	-.04	.09
9. Telephoning	-.13	-.14	-.07
10. Poll watching	-.03	-.14	-.08
11. Fund raising	-.19	-.20	-.05
12. Other	-.21	-.14	-.16
N =	(55)	(37)	(62)

Note: Political views scored on 6-point scale (1=highly conservative, 6=radical). Summary participation and areas of participation scored 1 for presence of activity, 0 otherwise. N for political views = 52. Dash = frequency of participation too small to calculate correlation.

*$p < .05$

TABLE 24

CORRELATIONS OF MORAL REASONING AND

LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES

	Frequency			Enjoyment		
	MJ	MJB	Ed	MJ	MJB	Ed
Attending theater, concerts	.40*	.37*	.36*	.34*	.25	.36*
Professional association, meetings	.36*	.12	.39*	.31*	.23	.37*
Reading	.28*	.28*	.25*	.17	.10	.29*
Community, political activity	.22	.11	.14	.28*	.18	.31*
Church activities	.22	.11	.19	.18	.05	.12
Discussion groups	.20	.01	.14	.30*	.20	.29*
Physical activity	.14	.23	.17	.43*	.38*	.16
Outdoor activities	.08	-.04	.05	.10	.03	.06
Go out for dinner	.07	.00	.10	-.06	-.02	-.10
Playing music	-.05	-.12	-.11	.12	.10	.05
Visit friends	-.06	-.11	-.04	.15	.13	.20
Crafts	-.09	-.12	-.10	-.08	-.13	-.17
Watching movies, TV	-.11	-.17	-.14	.30*	.21	.10
Visit relatives	-.12	-.19	-.11	.06	.00	-.09
N =	(56)	(39)	(63)	(54)	(37)	(61)

Note: Frequency scored on 5-point scale, 1=never, 5=daily. Enjoyment scored on 5-point scale, 1=not at all, 5-very much.

*p < .01

to be distinguished from their lower stage colleagues in the more cognitive areas, not in the social ones. The high correlation of moral reasoning with enjoyment of physical activity may at first seem to be an exception to this pattern. However, when we consider that many of the lower stage subjects are manual workers, small business owners, and sales clerks, we see that such persons may not consider physical exercise as much a leisure-time diversion as does the desk-bound executive or professional. While the foregoing leisure activities certainly convey a clear picture of the life of a higher stage individual, the direct effect of moral reasoning on the performance of these activities is ambiguous. In nearly every case in which moral reasoning correlated with a particular activity, amount of education did also. It appears then that we have described a pattern of leisure-time activities characteristic of persons who have cultivated a wide range of intellectual pursuits, moral reasoning included.

Summary of OGS Attitude and Action Data

In summary, we found the attitudes and actions of higher stage subjects to be ones which

(1) rejected conventional values (especially obedience) both for themselves and their children (Tables 19, 22);

(2) were accepting and affectionate towards their wives (Table 18);

(3) rejected love withdrawal but favored the critical examination of rules and moral issues as a childrearing technique (Tables 17, 18, 20, 21); and

(4) taught their children a concern for the needs and welfare of others and a concern for the commitments made to others (Table 22).

On the other hand, higher stage subjects were

(5) no more satisfied in either their marriages or their jobs than were lower stage subjects though they did find their jobs to be more involving

and more closely approximating an ideal occupation (Tables 16, 17, 18). In the area of behaviors, higher stage subjects were

(6) active in politics regardless of party view (Table 23); and

(7) spend their leisure time predominantly engaged in intellectual and cultural pursuits (Table 24).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF QUALITATIVE REASONING

While the analysis of quantitative data allowed us to place moral reasoning in a network of demographic and cognitive life outcome variables it did not enable us to gain a qualitative look at the differences with which persons at various stages reason about their own lives. In order to do this we conducted a semi-structured, one-half hour interview with 20 of the Kohlberg subjects, focusing on the subject's perceptions of his job, parenting, and marital interaction. The interview took place during sessions with those subjects who were recontacted by Kohlberg between March 1976 and March 1977. Subjects recontacted before or after that time were not included. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. The "Life Outcomes Interview" appears in Appendix D.

Analysis of the data began with the construction of coding categories for each interview question. THree protocols known to be at the high and low ends of the moral reasoning scale were selected for initial category construction. Subsequent protocols were placed into these categories with new categories being added where necessary. Thus, the qualitative analysis must be considered descriptive, not hypothesis testing. However, in light of our method of category construction and the generally high inter-judge reliability we feel that the categories are robust and should withstand hypothesis testing in a future sample.

Reliability. A randomly chosen sample of 10 protocols was given to a second rater who scored the protocols using the categories we had constructed. Reliability of the second rater with the category

constructor was $p < .05$ as measured by Cohen's Kappa which corrected for chance agreement (Cohen, 1960).

Substage typology as a basis for category construction. In the process of constructing the Life Outcomes Interview response categories we were guided by the four major divisions of the substage system. Our approach was to ask, Is this subject basically taking a norm-following, consequential (utilitarian), relationship-forming (perfectionistic) or fairness, orientation to the issue at hand?, In short, we integrated the conceptual framework of the substages with the surface content of the espoused philosophy. In most cases the marriage was useful. Where the substage orientations would have seemed far-fetched (e.g., resolution of conflict with wife or children) we stuck close to the surface content. This was in keeping with our approach of using the orientations as a theoretical guide; we would not let them distort the data.

The purpose of basing our categories on the substage orientations was to integrate the job categories with a larger base of research. In this way, the substage orientations were used as four fairly exhaustive ways of looking at the whole social world, not simply the moral world.

Job Philosophy. The first question in the Life Outcomes Interview to be analyzed asked, Do you have any philosophy with which you go about your job? Five types of philosophies were distinguished. Brief descriptions of the most frequent types are presented below, along with exemplary quotes from the subjects (Table 25). The actual distribution of the use of these types by persons at each major stage of moral reasoning follows the brief definitions (Table 26).

Table 25

BRIEF DEFINITIONS OF JOB PHILOSOPHIES

1. Norm following: Job should be performed consistent with socially approved virtues. Conformity to the common role expectations of job is expected.

   Example

   I try to do it right and I like to do my work neat unless there are interferring factors. If I get a little mad or upset over something that happened, I may occasionally say I will do it that way. I will do it the fastest way it can be done and I don't care what it looks like as long as it works.

   [Case #93]

2. Utilitarianism: Act so as to achieve positive consequences for self or company. Techniques usually involve increased efficiency.

   Example

   I guess the most important thing, since our prices are pretty much controlled by manufacturing efficiencies and most of the major tire companies have developed a pretty efficient manufacturing procedure, is to sell ourselves. Our only hope of selling tires to a given account is to sell a particular advantage, or better customer service, quicker delivery, faster follow-up or whatever it might be.

   [Case #50]

3. Fairness: Be aware that the other party (client, customer, student, etc.) has contributed something of value to the subject-other interchange. It is fair that the other receive his legitimately agreed upon service or good in exchange.

   Example

   Generally speaking I try to be as objective as I can. I think that is part of the basic responsibility. I try and be as honest and fair as I can. I am often caught in the middle in problems involving the unions and the company, you have to go at those problems probably a little more objectively than you would with a different situation. All we expect out of each and every operator is that they are paid for a fair day's work.

   [Case #3]

Table 25 (Cont'd)

BRIEF DEFINITIONS OF JOB PHILOSOPHIES

4. Perfectionism: Develop a relationship between self and client. Understand the situation from client's perspective. Act so as to fulfill client's best interests and develop client's own autonomy.

Example

> Basically as honestly or openly as I can. I have actually told customers I don't think they have any business building kits and I have actually recommended that they don't buy certain things. And sometimes they have bought them in spite of that and sometimes they have said, okay, I don't want that. I feel as long as I present, from my perspective, what I perceive their needs to be as honestly as I can, I am doing the job that is most helpful to the customer, and furthering his interest in building kits.
>
> [Case #37]

As shown in Table 22, types 1 and 2 were most common among lower stage subjects, while types 3 and 4 were most frequently held by persons at the higher stages of moral reasoning. It seems that higher stage job philosophy was distinguished especially by an overt concern for developing the personhood of other individuals (type 4). This category most clearly involves the act of placing oneself in other's position, i.e., the act of role taking. While utilitarianism (type 2) approaches the job from the perspective of accomplishing the greatest good for self or other, perfectionism (type 4) finds some aspect of the other's personality (likes, wishes, desires) that will be fulfilled by the job actor. The result of the perfectionistic attitude is both the development of the personality of the client and the creation of a realtionship between client and job actor. Also common among higher stage subjects was type 3, an explicit concern with fair exchange as a part of the relationship. As in the case of type 4, fairness conceptualizes the job as a two-way interaction. In comparison, the philosophy most frequently found among stage 3 subjects is unidirectional. Type 1 (norm following) simply emphasizes the need to live up to the common expectations of doing a good, honest job. The actor need not try to role take or see the situation from his client's or superior's position.

TABLE 26

JOB PHILOSOPHY FREQUENCIES

Categories	Stages				
	3	3/4	4	4/5	5
1. Norm Following	3	1	1		
2. Utilitarianism		2	1		
3. Fairness	1		1	1	2
4. Perfectionism				1	3

Note: N=17. Others = 1. Not asked or no response = 2

Job satisfactions. The analysis of job satisfactions yielded the categories shown in Table 27.

TABLE 27

JOB SATISFACTION BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS

1. Job well-done: Satisfaction derives from doing a job well. Subject can take pride in his work.

Example

WHAT ARE YOUR GREATEST SATISFACTIONS ABOUT YOUR WORK?

I like to be able to finish a job and have the time to be able to finish a job and sit back and say that's nice, it is something that I can be proud of.

WHY IS THAT SATISFYING?

I don't know, I just think that it is a matter of pride. I like to have things in order and nice and that is all I can say. I like to do it that way because when I am done I know that I did it right, the way it was supposed to be done.

[Case #93]

2. Reward seeking—compliments or money: Satisfaction is based on a direct, explicit reward, either a compliment or money. Unlike category 5 in which a reward may evidence a deeper interaction, in this category the reward itself is paramount. Usually the reward indicates a job well done.

Example

ANYTHING ELSE THAT IS A SATISFACTION?

The pay, and when the boss comes by and gives you a compliment, that kind of makes you feel good. Some bosses they come by and they won't say beans to you no matter what you are doing. Like the last boss I had would try to be a comedian and he would say that looks crummy and I would feel hey, I didn't do nothing. But if you get a boss that says hey, you are doing a fine job, you give the guy a little bit more.

WHY IS THAT A SATISFACTION?

You know, they compliment you on something you've done, you've done something to make them happy, you feel the time you spent here is not wasted.

[Case #95]

TABLE 27, continued

3. Cognitive stimulation--people: Satisfaction derives from simply being with people or from interacting with them in a minimal way.

Example

WHAT ABOUT YOUR WORK GIVES YOU THE MOST SATISFACTION?

Dealing with others. Off the record, dealing with the celebrities that I have through the years, it seems everywhere I go I run into Daley, the mayor of Chicago, and I have dealt with him through the years and most people have never seen him and I stand next to him and deal with him. I worked for the McCormick Place, exposition hall, unrelated to my present job and dealt with the Billy Graham crusade that was here several years ago and I was the only one out of 350,000 people that was able to get Billy Graham's autograph on his book, the only one out of all that attended.

[Case #26]

4. Serving others: Subject performs a service which has positive consequence for other(s). May take great pride in suiting customer but does not go beyond "order-taking role". Does not try to evaluate specific request in light of "whole person."

Example

WHAT ARE THE THINGS THAT GIVE YOU THE MOST SATISFACTION ABOUT YOUR WORK?

Helping people primarily, injured people, sick people, people that need help, but they don't know who else to call, so they call the police and it isn't a police function, but the service type of calls, where you can help people, that gives you a lot of satisfaction, knowing that they were thankful that you were around to help them and it wasn't even a police function, we can get called for some of the dumbest things, how to shut off the water and how you change a fuse and things like that, but they are really thankful, that you spent the time, they know it is not your job to do it, but they don't know who else to call, so they call the police, and the police come out and help them and in ambulance calls and things, take people with heart attacks, just an honest thank you is great.

[Case #38]

5. Interaction with people: The subject develops relationships with others beyond that which is necessary for the performance of the subject's job. Statements here suggest that the subject has enthusiasm for people per se and treats each as a whole individual. Compare to category 4 in which the subject simply performs a service specified by the customer.

TABLE 27, continued

Example

WHAT ARE YOUR GREATEST SATISFACTIONS ABOUT YOUR WORK?

I suppose the greatest satisfaction so far is the interaction with my colleagues on the faculty here, more than the students so far, only because I have developed stronger relationships with faculty and I am learning a great deal from them. So I think the affiliation with this institution and with the people that it represents, not just the name, I am sure that is part of it, but the people that are here, and the sense that there are a lot of people here who care about what they are doing and have high standards and being part of that, and learning from it, and participating in it and hopefully contributing to it, are important.

[Case #42]

TABLE 28

DISTRIBUTION OF JOB SATISFACTION CATEGORIES BY MORAL REASONING

Categories	Stages 3	3/4	4	4/5	5
1. Job well done	3	1	2	1	
2. Seeking money, compliments	3	1	1		
3. Cognitive stimulation (people)	1	3			
4. Serving others		1	1	1	2
5. Interactive				1	3

Note - N = 25 Others = 10 Not asked, no answer = 0 Ss

Up to two satisfactions per subject. Only categories with frequency of more than two responses are included here.

As can be seen in Table 28, the satisfactions which are most common at the higher stages of moral reasoning involve relationships to others. The themes of knowing another individual's unique personality and interacting with others are dominant here. In comparison, at lower stages other individuals are seen as sources of praise or rewards but are not valued for themselves.

Job dissatisfactions. In the area of dissatisfactions, four categories were distinguished. Their brief descriptions and distribution by moral stage are contained in Tables 29 and 30. Again, higher stage subjects were characterized by their emphasis on ideal relations (category 4). Such subjects were dissatisfied when their performance did not live up to the standards which they themselves had set for either good interpersonal relations on the job or the delivery of a good product (human as well as physical). In comparison, dissatisfactions

among lower stage subjects involved what Hertzberg (1963) has called hygeine factors (e.g., pay, hours, traveling), grievances against corporate policies (e.g., failure to advance) and conflicts with boss or customers. Dissatisfactions with the concrete features of job and relations are consistent with the structure of Stage 3 moral reasoning. That structure sees the socio-moral world in terms of upholding actual mores and strives to maintain conventionally peaceful interpersonal relations.

TABLE 29

BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS OF DISSATISFACTIONS

1. Hygeine: Dissatisfied with concrete and natural environment, or schedule of job. These do not involve interpersonal conflict. They involve pay, hours, traveling, etc.

   Example

   Sometimes the hours. I have to stay later than I want to. [Case #26]

2. External Constraints: Dissatisfaction based on constraints provided by (a) other individuals (colleagues and clients, such as complaints (b) by superiors (e.g., criticism), OR by (c) the structure of the situation or institution (e.g., no opportunity for advancement).

   Example (of (a))

   Collecting, I don't particularly enjoy it. (WHY?) I don't know, if I had to do it once a week, but every day--it gets to be a hassle, having to hassle people. (ANYTHING ELSE?) When you are yelled at for no particular reason. [Case #1]

3. Conflict with Personal Habits: Dissatisfaction based on aspects of the job that conflict with personal habits. Primary complaint is time wasted or inefficient use of time.

TABLE 29 (continued)

Example

When I do something wrong, I have to do it over again. I don't like doing things twice. I just don't like doing things twice. It seems like I wasted part of my life, my time that I shouldn't have wasted to have to do it again. There is one other thing that I don't like about working, that is having someone else tell me what to do, that is why I only work for one guy and he alone knows that he is going to tell me what to do, and no one else, and no one else can tell me what to do.

[Case #32]

4. Ideal Relations: Dissatisfaction based on inability to meet subject's own ideal standards of (a) interpersonal relations with clients and colleagues OR (b) quality of product.

Example

Saturdays. Tomorrow, we will have hundreds and thousands of people in the store tomorrow. It will be very, very crowded, and we will do a lot of business and I don't get to spend that much time with anybody. It is a matter of staying at the counter and writing up things and the day goes by usually very quickly and I get very tired and you feel great at the end of the day, you had a fantastic day and all. But it is difficult because you don't get that personally involved with anybody, you don't have time for it.

[Case #37]

TABLE 30

DISTRIBUTION OF JOB DISSATISFACTIONS BY MORAL REASONING

Categories	Stages				
	3	3/4	4	4/5	5
1. Hygiene	2	2			
2. External Constraints	4		1	1	1
3. Personal Habits	1	1		1	1
4. Ideal Relations					4

Note: N= 19 responses. Other=6 responses Not asked, no answer = 0 subjects
Up to 2 responses per subject. Only categories with frequency > 2 cited here.

Moral issues on job. The next area of investigation involved the question, "What are the moral issues that you face in your work?" Responses were coded into two broad categories (Table 31). Category 2 (best interests of client) emphasized a concern with whether the subject's actions were actively benefiting another individual (usually a client). Such a concern suggests the activity of role-taking since it is first necessary to understand both the situation and interests of the other before determining which action will benefit the client most.

As seen in Table 32, category 2 was predominately used by higher stage subjects. In comparison, the moral issues of concern to lower stage subjects revolved around conventional aspects of doing an honest job (category 1). The orientation here was towards restraining oneself from harming others, from taking advantage of them, and from dishonestly reporting information.

TABLE 31

CODING CATEGORIES FOR MORAL ISSUES AT WORK

1. Norm Following. Concern with whether to follow the official standards of a good job. This includes honesty and not taking advantage of customers.

   Includes (among others) responses that emphasize restraining oneself from being unfair and harmful to others.

   Example: The basic moral issue is trying not to snow the customer as far as coming in for one thing, and selling him more than he needs. If the car pulls to the right and I test drive it and find out that it has a low tire, I won't hit him for a front end alignment and call him up and tell him he needs ball joints.

   [Case #26]

   The basic moral issue is what I put down on that piece of paper, whether or not it is excuses or the truth.

   [Case #93]

2. Have Best Interests of Client or Welfare of Other at Heart. Concern with positive action that is in others' (client's or colleagues) best interest. Such action usually involves (or suggests) the prerequisite of understanding other and situation well enough to determine where the best interest lies. Thus, active role-taking is stated or implied.

   Example: In dealing with people you face certain moral things like "Is the work we are doing for these guys really worthwhile?" "Is the idea to go out and build a plant to make better natural gas on a Navajho Reservation really in the best interests of the Navajho people, or is it the best allocation of resources?" They have a program they want to implement and we have to work on that.

   [Case #67]

Such concerns, though certainly virtuous, do not require the active assessment of other's interests and one's own optimal behavior (as in category 1).

TABLE 32

DISTRIBUTION OF MORAL ISSUES ON JOB BY MORAL STAGE

Categories	Stages 3	4	5
1. Norm following	6	2	2
2. Best interest of client	0	0	5
Other = 3			N=15

Contribution to society. Another area of research asked, "In what way do you feel that you are making a contribution to society in your work?" Again, two types of responses were received frequently enough to constitute stable categories (Table 33). Higher stage subjects indicated that their contributions were ones which went beyond simply maintaining society (Table 34). Contributions of higher stage subjects consisted of research, inventions and improvement of human relations, all contributing to a development in the quality of human life. In comparison, lower stage subjects most often cited their contributions as ones which simply kept society going, ones that maintain social functioning.

In this area we should be particularly atuned to the confounding of moral reasoning and job status. Since lower stage persons hold lower status jobs they probably do not have the opportunity to make decisions of creative or innovative scope. While this no doubt accounts for some of

TABLE 33

BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS:

1. Fulfills social function: Keeps society going

Contribution is maintenance of society. Subject performs a social function but does not go beyond normally expected behavior in that role.

Example

I splice telephone cables. If we didn't have telephones society nowadays would be down the drain, hardly anybody could perform the jobs they do without a telephone.

2. Improve quality of life (goes beyond present or minimally necessary life forms):

Contributions in this category go beyond maintenance of society. They involve research, inventions, and improvements in human relations. The underlying idea is that the contributions go beyond what is minimally or traditionally expected of someone performing the particular job.

Example

I am trying to develop answers to energy, it is a very serious situation that would affect everybody. I weigh the costs and benefits of the proposed solutions, whereas before I was involved in a project that was actually detrimental to the environment—plastic pop bottles.

TABLE 34

DISTRIBUTION OF CONTRIBUTION TO SOCIETY CATEGORIES BY MORAL REASONING

	Stages		
	3	4	5
1. Fulfill social function	8	3	1
2. Improve quality of life	0	0	5

Other = 2 Not asked = 1 N = 17

the variance, it is instructive to consider our stage 5 toy salesman. His response is as follows:

> I think to some extent I am making a contribution by being an honest salesman, honest with my customers. Basically they can see that honestly and see that I am honest in business even as a salesman. I don't see it as really very creative in terms of that, and consequently it lacks in terms of total satisfaction. It is not offensive enough to be totally uncomfortable. It's just incomplete enough to make me want to do more.
>
> [Case #37, italics added]

Despite the limited social influence of a toy salesman, a fact that our high stage subject is well aware of, he tries to convey a moral message to his customers. That is, that there can be (and by inference should be) ethical standards in business.

Job-life relationship. The final question concerning job activity asked, "Do you see any relationship between your job and your life in general?" Five categories of response were distinguished. However, no clear association with moral reasoning was found. The coding categories appear in Appendix A.

Parenting and Marital Interaction

Good father. The area of parenting and marital interaction was opened with the question, "In what ways do you believe you have been a good father?" (or in the case of childless subjects, "What are the qualities of a good father?"). Five types of parental qualities were distinguished, as shown in Table 35. Their distribution by moral stage appears in Table 36. The type most often used by higher stage subjects indicated that the father recognized each child's unique personality and unique perspective on the world (category 5). Once again, high moral reasoning is associated with the ability to take the perspective of another.

TABLE 35

BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS OF GOOD FATHER CHARACTERISTICS

Question: In what ways do you feel that you have been a good father?

1. Provides basic necessities of life (material or emotional) --

Provides food, love, education, etc., for children.

Example: I try to provide the kids with what they need. I try to give them a good education, love, and understanding-- which is not always easy when I go to my tools in my garage. I provide for them: food, shelter, a little recreation. [Case #26]

2. Teach good values, teach right and wrong -- Father implants

good character (in general or banal terms), social virtues,

and/or good citizenship.

Example: My kids seem to be acquiring the right attitudes towards things and when they do something wrong they seem to know that they are doing it wrong. I must be doing something right. I try to show them as much as tell them what should be done and what shouldn't be done, but that's about it, if you tell them, you tell them, and that's about all you can do. [Case #93]

3. Rears self-sufficient, capable persons -- Father rears children who

have the ability to make their own way in the world (in the sense of

efficiency, not in terms of higher values).

Example: At this point my kids are young and are not capable of making a rational statement, but hopefully I will instill in them the knowledge that they can think things out and do what is right for themselves when they are old enough. [Case #38]

4. Encourage child to care for others and develop father-child relationship --

Time spent togehter develops father-child relationship and teaches

child the general value of good interpersonal relationships.

Example: I spend a lot of time with the kids. Even though I don't see them during the day, I do spend quite a bit of time with them each night. I give them a bath, read them books, and I try to be close to them. I think we have a pretty good relationship. [Case #48]

Table 35 (continued)

5. Realize child's unique perspective and personality -- Father realizes that child has his or her own view of the world and his or her own values. Father encourages the child to express them. Father listens to the child, appreciates child's perspective.

   Example: I am trying to set an example, trying to always keep in mind that Scot is an individual with his ideas and things that are important to him. There are things in his little world that are very important to him that seem like trivia to me, but I try to see his point of view. [Case #67]

TABLE 36

FREQUENCIES OF GOOD FATHER PHILOSOPHIES

BY MORAL REASONING

Categories	Stages				
	3	3/4	4	4/5	5
1. Necessities of life	3	1			
2. Good values	1	1½	1		
3. Self-sufficient		1		1	
4. Child's relationships		½			2
5. Child's uniqueness				2	2

Note: N = 16 Other = Not asked or no answer =

Another approach to fatherhood used by higher stage subjects was to encourage children to care for others, or to develop a good relationship with others (category 4). Categories 4 and 5 are based on the modes of fairness (respect for personality) and perfectionism (developing relationships), respectively.

In comparison, lower stage subjects consider themselves successful fathers if they provide the basic necessities of life (both material and emotional) as represented in category 1 and if they teach their children general concepts of right and wrong (category 2). Both of these categories are interpreted as norm-following; a good father should live up to the conventionally defined requirements of the role. Both categories are defined from the viewpoint of the father, (i.e., he should provide for, or teach the child). They give no evidence of role-taking, of seeing the child's unique (as opposed to culturally defined) needs and do not see the child as interacting with others.

Failed as father. The opposite side of the "good father" coin, "In what ways have you failed as a father?" yielded less valuable information. The first reason for this is that the question was not asked on 9 out of the 20 interviews. The remaining cases yielded five categories. However, there was no category which clearly distinguished high and low stage subjects. Responses to this question were more concrete, at all stages, than to the "good father" question. For example, typical responses to the "failure" question given by subjects at many stages were; "Sometimes I fly off the handle a little bit and I have a way of communicating and handling stress that isn't as adequate as it should be [Ware] and "I wish we had not delayed in getting our son a brother or sister."[Askew]. Based on our limited data we might speculate that persons compliment themselves in accordance with their most sophisticated ideals but criticize themselves for relatively concrete failings.

Ideals for Children

Along with the characteristics that make a good father are the ideals that a father has for his children. Five types of ideals were identified (Table 37). Again, the notion of concern for others (Category 5) was used most frequently at higher stages (Table 38). Going back to our substage typology, this concept is based on Perfectionism (element 12, group improvement). Also based on Perfectionism (element 10) is Category 4, "ego development." This category, too, was used by higher stage subjects. In short, higher subjects convey ideals that encourage their children to critically examine and improve both themselves and the world. In comparison, the ideals of lower stage persons are norm following. These subjects are preparing their children to take their places in society as now constituted (see especially Categories 1 and 2).

TABLE 37

BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS OF IDEALS FOR CHILDREN

Question: What values or ideals do you have for your children?

1. Lead a decent life (bag of virtues) -- Be trustworthy, honest, well-mannered, respectable.

   Example: Just being honest with themselves, have a good moral code. I would say similar--it would not have to be exactly like mine--but the moral code of what I am trying to teach them: Tell the truth and keep your hands off something that doesn't belong to you and do the best you can. [Case #26]

2. Do not interfere with others -- Often stated as "respect others," meaning "respect other's property, other's freedom." This is essentially an inactive, laissez-faire philosophy. Do not confust with the active category, "Welfare of others"--category #5).

   [No example]

Table 37

3. Be self-sufficient -- Know how to handle oneself in the world. Suggests self-sufficiency in a physical-practical sense. No mention of psychic differentiation or self-reflection. Do not confuse with Category #4, "ego development."

> Example: Yah, they will do what I say and hopefully it will instill in them the knowledge that they can think things out and do what is right for themselves when they are old enough. [Case #38]

4. Child's ego development -- The emphasis here is on both the fulfillment of one's own potentials and the development of an integrated, self-reflective mind. In short, we may call this category self-actualization. Note that it is not simply "become competent, self sufficient."

> Example: I want them to become like me. That is the hardest thing, to let them be their own way. I want them to be the kind of people who care about other people without being destructively vulnerable, without being able to be destroyed by someone else, to be able to be hurt, but not destroyed by other humans. To be strong enough and to be able to assert and understand themselves as persons, and yet accept the influence of others. [Case #37]

5. Concern for welfare of others (form good relationships with others) -- The key to this category is the concept of a relationship between self and other. While "relationship" itself need not be mentioned, related notions such as caring about others or putting self in others' shoes (both of which are stated in a positive, active form) suggest an ongoing relationship-seeking process. Also included here is an appreciation of others' unique personalities.

> Example: Competent. Intelligent and--in whatever field they choose to practice in and competent, capable of achieving success of something like that. But responsible, concerned about their actions and the influence that their actions have on other people, caring, people who are capable of developing strong relationships with friends and mates and whatever. And people who care not only about other individuals, but about some higher values in terms of improvements in conditions in the world. [Case #42]

TABLE 38

DISTRIBUTION OF IDEALS FOR CHILDREN

BY MORAL REASONING

Categories	Stages				
	3	3/4	4	4/5	5
1. Decent life	3	1			
2. Non-interference		1	1		
3. Self-sufficient		1		1	
4. Ego development		1			2
5. Welfare of others				1	4

Note: N = 16 Not asked, no answer = 4

Marital Conflict Resolution

The final area of familial activity deals with the handling of disputes with wife (and occasionally with child). The area of conflict resolution was seen as having three components: (1) information gathering (diadactic vs. role-taking), (2) style of discussion (emotional vs. logical), and (3) the type of solution (concession vs. consensus). The latter two areas (type of solution and style of discussion), taken together, were considered the process of conflict resolution. A brief description of each of the two process dimensions is contained in Tables 39 and 40.

TABLE 39

CONFLICT WITH WIFE:

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF STYLE OF DISCUSSION

Pole 1: Emotional, non-rational. Subject either yells at wife or states his position without trying to develop an interaction.

> Example: Now we are down to regular yelling and screaming; before we had fist fights, she was a big enough girl, she could swing back . . . We got out income tax back and I paid off most of the car, and she had it in her mind we were going to do this with the money and eventually we ended up getting what she wanted. The last three income tax checks. So I just try to explain to her and hope for the best and when she starts yelling, I used to get really upset, and I have a quick wick, not as bad as it used to be. When we are yelling, we can get pretty nasty, I suppose. We don't get into fist fights anymore and swinging because I feel that is not going to help her. . . . [Case #95]

Pole 2: Rational, states position calmly, logically orients towards achieving a solution, though method may be either flexible or rigid (see Dimension 3).

> Example: They are often handled by shouting, but I don't like that. I alluded to that earlier. Basically, the first thing I try to do is reduce the tension level and explore in some rational sense the differences that exist between us, or understand why we are seeing things the way we are seeing them and recognize that there are different points of view. Try to reach consensus, I guess is what I'm saying, by force of logical reasoning as opposed to emotional, stressful kinds of decisions. [Case #42]

TABLE 40

CONFLICT WITH WIFE:

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF TYPE OF SOLUTION

Pole 1: Winner, subject is rigid in his approach. Either states his views dogmatically (including views that are solely emotional outbursts) or expects that one party will be proven right, the other wrong. May achieve a solution by one party giving in or being dominated.

> Example: Argue. Scream and yell and stuff. I don't like to, but I didn't say I wouldn't. Generally she will give in, or we will both come around and after the temperature goes down a little bit, we talk about it. It depends on how mad I get. I can be as stubborn and bullheaded as the next person, I think. That is both our problems--we are both headstrong. Not right at the moment, no [we are not oriented towards finding a solution]. Yes, probably [I am more oriented towards expressing my feelings which] occasionally [leads to problems]. [Case #26]

Pole 2: Consensus, subject is flexible. Adjusts views in order to achieve a solution. Realizes that neither party is all right or all wrong. Is willing to learn from other.

> Example: Usually we just resolve it by discussion. Try and think about the needs, what the other person is really saying, what is really the problem. Lots of times, sometimes can just start an argument and that really is not the problem and hopefully you try and be honest about it, and get to what is really the problem. [Do you have any ground rules there?] I don't think so. I can't think of any. We try and be civilized and just discuss things. [Case #48] (Note: See also Ware above.)
>
> (Shultz is a good case of rational/inflexible.)

The distribution of process categories by stage of moral reasoning appears in Table 41.

TABLE 41

RELATIONSHIP OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION PROCESS

DIMENSIONS TO MORAL REASONING

Categories	Stages 3	3/4	4	4/5	5
Dimension: Style of Discussion					
1. Emotional	2	1			
2. Rational	1	3	1	2	2
Dimension: Type of Solution					
1. (concession)	5				½
2. Flexible (consensus)		2	1	1	3

Note: Style of Discussion, N = 12 Type of Solution, N = 12 1/2

Not asked, no answer = Not asked, no answer =

Other categories = Other categories =

As Table 41 indicates, higher stage reasoning is sufficient but not necessary to exclude the use of processes that are either emotional or rigid. While all of the subjects who used these processes were at the lower moral stages, not all subjects at the lower stages used these processes.

When the dimensions of process are combined with types of information gathering, we arrive at four major patterns by which marital disputes are handled. A brief description of each type appears in Table 42. The first part of each description emphasizes the manner of information gathering; the second part presents the resolution process. The distribution of conflict-resolution patterns by stage of moral reasoning appears in Table 43.

TABLE 42

CODING FORM: CONFLICT WITH WIFE

Type 1: States Position. Each party states or explains his/her point of view. This may be logical, emotional (e.g., screams, yells), or both. There is no role-taking, no attempt to find out what other is thinking.

Process: Expressive only. No orientation to compromise. No adjusting views in relation to other. Is either not concerned with finding a solution, or solves conflict by one party winning, the other giving in.

> Example: I just try to explain to her and hope for the best and when she starts yelling I used to get really upset and I have a quick wick. When we start yelling, we can get pretty nasty, I suppose. We don't get into fist fights anymore because I feel that is not going to help her. [Case #95]

Type 2: Interactive. Each party states position (as in Type 1) but for the purpose of reaching a compromise. Individuals react to each other's arguments indicating agreement, disagreement, and validity of reasoning. There is still no role-taking, no attempt to see situation from other's perspective.

Process: Usually compromise, consensus. Best of both opinions are accepted. Illogic or inadequacy of other's arguments are shown.

> Example: We have a decent situation and we very seldom have any conflicts. We have occasional disagreements, but they are very easily settled, by mutual compromise.
>
> In some way we talk it out to whatever we feel is the best solution. sometimes I will give in to her opinion and sometimes she gives in to my opinion, depending on whatever the problem might be. I don't think we handle all of them the same way every time. I can't think if one has come up recently. I guess when you have a compromise you have two

Table 42 (continued)

opposite or two disagreeing points of view, and if the two people can sit down and say why I feel we should do it this way and then the other person says, well, here is why I don't think we should do it that way, and someplace in between hopefully have a happy medium.

[Case #50]

Type 3: Interacting/Eliciting. Subject makes a conscious effort to elicit or draw out wife's views. Realizes that they may be different from his own. While he appreciates diversity, he does not take wife's perspective. Rather he evaluates adequacy of wife's views as in Type 2 (Interactive).

Process: As in Type 2.

Example: I would try and reason it out, I guess, try and look at his point of view, and try and convince him of my point of view, try and be open-minded I guess. I would have to try and get his ideas, and try and tell him my ideas, and see what we came up with. Well, if you know his ideas, you can establish a difference, if you think he is going wrong, you will know were he is going wrong. On the other hand, he might come up with good solid ideas in his favor, and you might learn something yourself.

[Case #68]

Type 4: Role Taking. Consciously tries to see situation from wife's perspective. Realizes there are multiple points of view, stemming from different backgrounds, interests, and capabilities.

Process: Seeks a solution that will accommodate each party's unique interests as well as further the relationship.

Example: They are often handled by shouting, but I don't like that. I alluded to that earlier. Basically, the first thing I try to do is reduce the tension level and explore in some rational sense the differences that exist between us, or understand why we are seeing things the way we are seeing them and recognize that there are different points of view. Try to reach consensus, I guess, is what I am saying, by force of logical reasoning as opposed to emotional, stressful kinds of decisions.

[Case #42]

TABLE 43

FREQUENCY OF CONFLICT WITH WIFE CATEGORIES BY MORAL REASONING

Categories	Stages				
	3	3/4	4	4/5	5
1. State Position	5				
2. Interactive		2		1	
3. Interaction/Eliciting			1		
4. Role-Taking				2	2

Note: N = 13 Not asked or no answer =

Other categories =

The main feature which distinguished higher and lower stage reasoning is the quality of role-taking. Higher stage subjects explicitly put themselves in their wives' shoes to better understand the frustrations and claims of her position. It is this mechanism which can best be counted on to lead to an equitable solution or compromise. In comparison, lower stage subjects approach the conflict as a zero-sum game. One party wins, the other loses. The purpose of stating positions is only to determine whose argument is more sensible or which personality is more forceful.

Summary of Job and Marital Philosophy

What is the overall picture of the philosophy and behaviors of higher and lower stage individuals in the areas of job and marital interaction? Table 44 summarizes the response categories that were most clearly associated with high and low stage moral reasoning.

In order to interpret the response categories in Table 44, let us return to our substage typology. All of the categories associated with high moral reasoning represent the mode of perfectionism while the lower stage categories derive from norm following. Thus, it appears that the job and marital attitudes of higher stage subjects are more concerned with interpersonal relationships, either establishing them (as in the case of ideals for children), perfecting them (job philosophy), or gaining satisfaction from them. The skill which marks high stage persons' approach to job and family interaction is the process of role-taking. Higher stage individuals seem to make attempts to see the situation from the other's perspective, be it child (good father), wife (conflict with wife), or client (moral issues on the job). It is only when a social actor understands the other party's perspective that he can truly empathize and/or develop an equilibrated relationship.

In comparison, the approach to job and marital situations employed by lower stage individuals seems to be norm-following. Such persons look towards the commonly expected demands of job or familial situation to dictate the behavior which will be considered conventionally virtuous. Thus, lower stage individuals are more concerned about providing the necessities of life for their families, and encouraging their children to live up to conventionally defined "good" behaviour. On the job, lower stage subjects tend to be more dissatisfied over factors which are normatively set (pay, hours, and

TABLE 44

SUMMARY OF LIFE OUTCOME INTERVIEW CODING CATEGORIES

Question Area	Orientation: Norm Following	Orientation: Utility	Orientation: Perfection of Relationships and Justice
Job Philosophy	1. Norm Following	2. Utilitarian	4. Perfection 3. (Justice)
Satisfactions	1. Job Well Done 2. Seeking Compliments	3. Cognitive Stimulation	4. Serving Others 5. Interactive
Dissatis-factions	1. Hygiene 2. External Constraints	3. Conflict with Personal Habit	4. Ideal Relations
Moral Issues at Work	1. Norm Following		2. Have Best Interest of Client at Heart
Good Father	1. Provide Neces-sities 2. Teach Good Values	3. Rear Self-Sufficient Persons	4. Encourage Child to Care for Others 5. Realize Child's Unique Perspective
Ideals for Children	1. Lead Decent Life 2. Do Not Inter-fere with Others	3. Be Self-Sufficient	4. Child's Ego Development 5. Concern for Others' Welfare
Conflict Resolution	1. State Position	2. Interactive 3. Interactive-Eliciting	4. Role-Taking
Type of Solution	1. Concession		2. Consensus

Note: Numbers next to each category correspond to those used in "brief description" tables.

criticism from the boss). Similarly, they tend to find satisfaction in just the opposite of these factors (good pay, good hours, and compliments from the boss or customers). Furthermore, lower stage subjects look towards norms in determining praise. They commend themselves for a job well done and see their contribution to society as maintaining its functioning. There is no evidence of reflective thinking as was seen in the attitudes of higher stage persons. Social behavior, individual roles, and the manner in which socieity functions, are all accepted without thought given to some more idealized and fairer system. Lower stage subjects may sometimes complain about their lot in life but they rarely propose alternatives. Lower stage subjects do not approach social situations with role-taking. Conflicts with wives are handled by stating positions, not by trying to understand the perspective of the other. Since social roles and behavior tend to be seen as fixed on this view, there may be less need for role-taking. Knowing an individual's status and role may be tantamount to knowing the content of that person's social reasoning. Furthermore, it may also be that it was an initial lack of role-taking ability that led lower stage subjects to both fall behind in their moral development and to construct a more fixed view of the social world.

CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

The last several years have seen major attempts to increase the complexity with which Americans reason about moral issues. Such efforts have ranged from moral education programs in all levels of schools to the passage of new ethics guidelines in nearly every professional organization and in nearly every branch of government. Given the major efforts at moral education, the present study was conducted to determine the types of lives that are led by persons who have naturally developed more sophisticated structures of moral thought. In this way it was expected that we would both deepen our understanding of the mechanisms by which moral reasoning is translated into daily behavior and would gain some picture of the individuals that sustained programs in moral education are likely to produce. The following conclusions about the relation of moral reasoning to life outcomes can now be drawn:

(1) As predicted in our first hypothesis, persons at higher stages of moral development are more likely to hold higher status jobs than are persons whose moral reasoning is less developed. The correlation between moral reasoning and job status in the combined sample (N=122) was $r=.52$, $p < .01$. [1]

(2) The moral reasoning-job status relationship remains significant even when education, intelligence, and father's job status are individually controlled. However, the relationship is not significant when the effects of education and intelligence are simultaneously controlled. Although moral reasoning does not predict job status beyond that predicted by the combination of education and intelligence, clear differences in job philosophies (see point 9) suggest that it is, at least partly, through the development of moral

---

1. Positive correlations are in the direction of being related to higher moral reasoning.

structures that the education- and intelligence-to-job status link is formed.

(3) A closer look at the moral reasoning-job status relationship reveals a theoretically meaningful pattern. At least in the Kohlberg sample, (N=55), Stage 4 reasoning was statistically necessary for the attainment of high status jobs (Table 45). Ninety-three percent of Kohlberg subjects at Stage 4 or above held jobs in the two highest status categories. This finding supports our second hypothesis. High status jobs require an individual to make decisions which will have considerable impact on the lives of others. Such decisions must often be made within an institutional framework (e.g., company, legal system, hospital), but where the individual has ultimate authority. These conditions appear to require the level of social perspective (i.e., system maintenance) emobdied in Stage 4 moral thinking.

(4) Furthermore, Stage 5 thought was associated exclusively with high status occupations (job categories 1 and 2). As hypothesized, no Stage 5 subjects were found in any of the three lowest job status categories. We can speculate that individuals who have exerted the cognitive effort required to develop advanced moral thinking are similarly motivated to achieve positions where they will have a direct hand in improving the quality of human life or in promoting justice.

We noted that the conclusions drawn in points 3 and 4 could not as clearly be made on the basis of OGS data. However, the superior quality of the moral judgment interviews in the Kohlberg sample suggests that where the two samples agree in the direction of a relationship but disagree in regard to its magnitude, the magnitude found in the Kohlberg data should be accepted.

TABLE 45*

FREQUENCY OF JOB STATUS BY MORAL REASONING

IN KOHLBERG SAMPLE

Job Status	Moral Stage								Row Totals
	2(3)	3(2)	3	3(4)	4(3)	4	4(5)	5(4)	
1. Big Business Executive, Major Professional						4 (36%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	8 (15%)
2. Medium Business Executive, Lesser Professional				2 (20%)	3 (30%)	2 (18%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	10 (18%)
3. Small Business, Minor Professional	1 (100%)		3 (23%)	6 (60%)	2 (25%)	4 (36%)			16 (29%)
4. Little Business, Clerk, Salesman		1 (25%)	1 (8%)		1 (13%)			1 (25%)	4 (7%)
5. Skilled Manual			6 (46%)	2 (20%)		1 (9%)			9 (16%)
6. Semi-Skilled Manual		3 (75%)	3 (23%)		2 (25%)				8 (15%)
Column Total Percent	1 (2%)	4 (7%)	13 (24%)	10 (18%)	8 (15%)	11 (20%)	4 (7%)	4 (7%)	TOTAL N= 55 (100%)

Note: Cell entries are frequencies and column percentages.

* Identical to Table 4.

(5) Contrary to our expectation, adolescent moral reasoning was a poor predictor of adult job status ($r=.15$),[2] though it was an excellent predictor of adult moral reasoning ($r=.65$, $p<.01$). Adolescents who are more developed in moral reasoning relative to their peers remain more developed as adults. Such persons also achieve high status jobs. However, of the many adolescents whose moral reasoning is average or below average, those whose thinking makes the greatest strides in the ensuing years are also the ones who go on to achieve high status jobs. In comparison to adolescent moral reasoning, high school grades and achievement tests both predict adult job status well. However, it appears that these measures are simply substitutes for IQ.

(6) While higher stage individuals hold more prestigious and responsible jobs, there is no evidence that they are more satisfied with them ($r=.15$), nor are they more satisfied with their marriages ($r=.05$). However, higher stage men do rate their actual jobs as coming closer to their ideal jobs than do lower stage men (.32). This effect is significant when job status is controlled.

(7) In the realm of life attitudes, the area that provided the most interesting findings involved views toward child-rearing. Previous studies have found that higher stage individuals are characterized by a preference for induction as a means of moral socialization (i.e., showing the logic of rules and behaviors) and by a rejection of love withdrawal. Our results confirmed the rarity with which love withdrawal is used by higher stage subjects ($r=-.33$) and confirmed the use of discussion (part of the induction syndrome) as the most typical moral socialization technique ($r=.28$, $p<.05$).

---

2. Subsequent correlations are based on either Kohlberg sample (N=55) or OGS (N=66). No measure was studied in both samples.

In the area of values transmission, higher stage fathers were characterized by their refection of a spate of "conventional" traits for their children (e.g., obedience, studiousness, manners) and by their support of "independence". Evidence that the valuing of independence is put into practice stems from the finding that higher stage fathers more often encourage their children to make their own decisions on moral issues and even to challenge decisions made by the parents themselves. The content of moral philosophies espoused by higher stage fathers teaches their children to maintain commitments to others and society ($r=.25$) and to be sensitive to the rights and needs of other individuals. In comparison, lower stage fathers more often encourage their children to make moral decisions based on obedience ($r=-.24$) and on the avoidance of punishment as well as on respect for rules and laws ($r=-.34$).

(8) In regard to behavior, higher stage men are more active in political events ($r=.24$) even after education and political orientation is controlled. It therefore appears that an increase in moral reasoning is directly related to an increase in political participation, a finding which underscores the need for moral education in a healthy democracy.

In contrast to lower stage men, the leisure time activities of high moral reasoners are marked by greater attendance at concerts, theatres, professional meetings, and by reading. However, such activity is as likely to be due to the effect of education as it is to moral thought.

(9) In regard to the strategies and philosophies with which individuals go about their jobs, parenting, and marital interaction, the thinking of higher stage men is distinguished by a greater orientation to the themes of developing ideal social relations and promoting justice. While lower stage subjects showed greater concern with what Hertzberg (1963) has called hygiene factors (pay, hours, promotion), higher stage individuals saw their

jobs as opportunities to understand the perspective of clients and to further the clients' welfare. Some of these differences are no doubt due to actual differences in the types of jobs that are held by higher and lower stage men. However, the same differences in thinking also seem to guide the parenting and marital behaviors of these same individuals. For example, lower stage men consider themselves to be good fathers if they have simply provided the basic material and emotional necessities of life (food, love, education). In comparison, the standards set by higher stage fathers include an understanding of their children's unique perspective and personalities and an encouragement of their children to develop relationships with others.

Perhaps, the most important single feature which distinguishes the thinking of higher stage individuals is the ability to see a situation from the perspective of another and to appreciate that other's particular values, goals, and constraints. It is such reasoning that provides the basis for improved or ideal interpersonal relations. We have seen evidence of such role-taking ability in the job and parenting philosophies of higher stage men. However, its clearest evidence occurs in the method by which marital conflicts are resolved. Both higher and lower stage men report that they have resorted to emotional outbursts during conflicts with their wives. This seems to have been especially common in the early days of marriage. However, great differences did arise in the manner in which individuals handled their emotional outbursts and in the strategies that were developed to resolve disputes in the future. Lower stage men continued to resolve disputes either through shouting or through a demand for concession by one of the parties. In comparison, higher stage individuals attempt to see the dispute from the wife's viewpoint, trying to understand the reasons for, and validity of, her claim. Such role-taking

activity most frequently leads to attempts at consensus, a rational procedure by which both viewpoints are respected and subject to change. While higher stage men develop a strategy that is oriented to a solution of the problem, lower stage men seem to be consumed with an evaluation of the personalities of the would be resolvers.

In summary, then, we may conclude that individuals who differ in moral reasoning have been found not only to achieve different stations in life, but also to have considerably different values and strategies by which they conduct their lives. If these are the kinds of values and strategies that are deemed desirable to enable a vibrant democratic society to exist, then continued efforts at moral education seem to be called for.

APPENDIX A

STAGES OF MORAL REASONING

SIX STAGES OF ORIENTATION TO INTENTIONS AND CONSEQUENCES (ASPECTS 1 AND 2) IN RESPONSE TO A MORAL DILEMMA

In Europe, a woman was near death from cancer. One drug might save her, a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The druggist was charging $2,000, ten times what the drug cost him to make. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No." The husband got desperate and broke into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife. Should the husband have done that? Why?

Stage 1. Motives and need-consequences of act are ignored in judging badness because of focus upon irrelevant physical form of the act (e.g., size of the lie), or of the consequences of the act (e.g., amount of physical damage).

Pro — He should steal the drug. It isn't really bad to take it. It isn't like he didn't ask to pay for it first. The drug he'd take is only worth $200, he's not really taking a $2,000 drug.

Con — He shouldn't steal the drug, it's a big crime. He didn't get permission, he used force and broke and entered. He did a lot of damage, stealing a very expensive drug and breaking up the store, too.

Stage 2. Judgment ignores label or physical consequences of the act because of the instrumental value of the act in serving a need, or because the act doesn't do harm in terms of the need of another. (Differentiates the human need-value of the act from its physical form or consequences.)

Pro — It's all right to steal the drug because she needs it and he wants her to live. It isn't that he wants to steal, but it's the way he has to use to get the drug to save her.

Con — He shouldn't steal it. The druggist isn't wrong or bad, he just wants to make a profit. That's what you're in business for, to make money.

Stage 3. Action evaluated according to the type of motive or person likely to perform the act. An act is not bad if it is an expression of a "nice" or altruistic motive or person and it is not good if it is the expression of a "mean" or selfish motive or person. Circumstances may excuse or justify deviant action. (Differentiates good motives to which an act is instrumental from human but selfish need to which it is instrumental.)

Pro — He should steal the drug. He was only doing something that was natural for a good husband to do. You can't blame him for doing something out of love for his wife, you'd blame him if he didn't love his wife enough to save her.

Con — He shouldn't steal. If his wife dies, he can't be blamed. It isn't because he's heartless or that he doesn't love her enough to do everything that he legally can. The druggist is the selfish or heartless one.

Stage 4. An act is always or categorically wrong, regardless of motives or circumstances, if it violates a rule and does foreseeable harm to others. (Differentiates action out of a sense of obligation to rule from action for generally "nice" or natural motives.)

Pro — You should steal it. If you did nothing you'd be letting your wife die, it's your responsibility if she dies. You have to take it with the idea of paying the druggist.

Con — It is a natural thing for Heinz to want to save his wife but it's still always wrong to steal. He still knows he's stealing and taking a valuable drug from the man who made it.

92

Stage 5. A formal statement that though circumstances or motive modify disapproval, as a general rule the means do not justify the ends. While circumstances justify deviant acts to some extent they do not make it right or lead to suspension of moral categories. (Differentiates moral blame because of the intent behind breaking the rule from the legal or principled necessity not to make exceptions to rules.)

Pro — The law wasn't set up for these circumstances. Taking the drug in this situation isn't really right, but it's justified to do it.

Con — You can't completely blame someone for stealing but extreme circumstances don't really justify taking the law in your own hands. You can't have everyone stealing whenever they get desperate. The end may be good, but the ends don't justify the means.

Stage 6. Good motives don't make an act right (or not wrong); but if an act follows from a decision to follow general self-chosen principles, it can't be wrong. It may be actually right to deviate from the rules, but only under circumstances forcing a choice between deviation from the rules and concrete violation of a moral principle. (Differentiates good motives of following a moral principle from natural motives as following a rule. Recognizes that moral principles don't allow exceptions any more than do legal rules.)

Pro — This is a situation which forces him to choose between stealing and letting his wife die. In a situation where the choice must be made, it is morally right to steal. He has to act in terms of the principle of preserving and respecting life.

Con — Heinz is faced with the decision of whether to consider the other people who need the drug just as badly as his wife. Heinz ought to act not according to his particular feelings toward his wife, but considering the value of all the lives involved.

Levels	Basis of Moral Judgment	Stages of Development
I	Moral value resides in external, quasi-physical happenings, in bad acts, or in quasi-physical needs rather than in persons and standards.	Stage 1: Obedience and punishment orientation. Egocentric deference to superior power or prestige, or a trouble-avoiding set. Objective responsibility.
		Stage 2: Naively egoistic orientation. Right action is that instrumentally satisfying the self's needs and occasionally others'. Awareness of relativism of value to each actor's needs and perspective. Naive egalitarianism and orientation to exchange and reciprocity.
II	Moral value resides in performing good or right roles, in maintaining the conventional order and the expectancies of others.	Stage 3: Good-boy orientation. Orientation to approval and to pleasing and helping others. Conformity to stereotypical images of majority or natural role behavior, and judgment by intentions.
		Stage 4: Authority and social-order maintaining orientation. Orientation to "doing duty" and to showing respect for authority and maintaining the given social order for its own sake. Regard for earned expectations of others.
III	Moral value resides in conformity by the self to shared or shareable standards, rights, or duties.	Stage 5: Contractual legalistic orientation. Recognition of an arbitrary element or starting point in rules or expectations for the sake of agreement. Duty defined in terms of contract, general avoidance of violation of the will or rights of others, and majority will and welfare.
		Stage 6: Conscience or principle orientation. Orientation not only to actually ordained social rules but to principles of choice involving appeal to logical universality and consistency. Orientation to conscience as a directing agent and to mutual respect and trust.

93

Source: Kohlberg, 1967, p. 171

APPENDIX B

Oakland Growth Study Questionnaire

Political and Social Participation

1. How do you see yourself politically:

   1. Strongly conservative
   2. Moderately conservative
   3. Middle-of-the-road
   4. Liberal
   5. Liberal-radical
   6. Radical
   7. Independent
   8. Unconcerned
   9. Other

2. Did you vote in the following presidential elections:

   Scoring for columns 2-4: 1. yes 2. no

   1960
   1964
   1968

3. Have you been active in any way in political-social organizations or causes?

   1. Yes
   2. No

   Scoring for columns 6-16: 1 if checked, otherwise 2:

   Committees
   Precinct work
   Telephoning
   Financial donations
   Letter stuffing
   Circulating petitions
   Marches
   Signing petitions
   Poll watching
   Fund raising
   Other

4. What organizations or causes were they:

   1. Political, partisan
   2. Political, non-partisan (school board elections, etc.)
   3. Community service
   4. Ecology, etc.
   5. Peace movement
   6. Civil rights
   7. Unclassified

Note: These items were selected from a larger questionnaire for analysis in this report.

5. How liberal or conservative are you:

Scoring for columns 30-33:

1. Much more conservative
2. More conservative
3. Same
4. More liberal
5. Much more liberal

Compared to the way you were at age 21?
Compared to your parents?
Compared to your children?
Compared to your spouse?

6. Do you belong to any social clubs, lodges, recreational, church or service organizations?

1. Yes
2. No

Scoring for specific organizations, by class - for each class select that organization for which activity is highest and indicate years belonged:

Degree of activity - in first column

1. Low
2. Medium
3. High

Years belonged - in second column

1. Less than one
2. 1-2.9
3. 3-5.9
4. 6-9.9
5. 10 and more

Veterans, Military, Patriotic, such as DAR, Gold Star Mothers, etc.

Organizations relating to Health, such as Ladies Aid (hospital)

Civil or Service (other than health) such as Lions, Kiwanis, PTA, YMCA, Ladies Aid (non-hospital), Chamber of Commerce, etc.

Political or Pressure Groups such as League of Women Voters, WTCU, Planned Parenthood, etc.

Lodges, Fraternal, Secret Societies, Mutual (sick) Benefit, Associations such as Mason, Moose, Sons of Italy, Woodmen, B'nia Brith, K of C, Shrines, etc.

Church, Religious Groups, such as Holy Names Society, Alter Society, Men's Club at Church, Ladies of Charity, Luther League, etc.

Economic, Occupational, Professional (other than Health or labor unions) such as truck drivers assoc., Law Enforcement Officers, Retail Grocers Assoc., etc.

Cultural, Educational, College Alumni (other than health) such as associations for family living, Lecture Club, Literary Club, etc.

Social, Sports, Hobby, Recreational (except specifically church-connected) such as Country Club, Bridge Club, Camera Club, Flower Club, Travel Club, etc.

7. Frequency and enjoyment of leisure-time activities:

For each item, frequency is scored 1-5 in first column allotted, as follows:

1. Never
2. Yearly
3. Monthly
4. Weekly
5. Daily

For each item, enjoyment is scored 1-5 in second column allotted as follows:

1. Not at all
2. Very little
3. Moderately
4. Quite a lot
5. Very much

Visiting with relatives
Visiting with friends
Going out for dinner
Outdoor activities
Reading
Music - Playing instruments or singing
Crafts and Hobbies
Movies, T.V.
Attending theatre, concerts, opera, museum, etc.
Community or political activities
Church activities
Discussion groups
Professional associations, meetings
Lodges, social groups
Physical activity
Sporting events
Others (not assignable to above)

Marriage and Attributes of Self and Spouse

8. Temperament of self and spouse:

Score 1-5 as indicated by placement of or X:

✓ for self in first column of pair.

X for spouse, in second column.

Optimistic, Pessimistic
Cheerful, Somber
Warm, Cool
Outgoing, Self-contained
Not worrying, Worrying

9. Expression of feelings toward each other:

Score 1-5 as indicated by placement of ✓ or X:

✓ for self in first column of pair.
X for spouse, in second column.

Affectionate, Undemonstrative
Seldom Angry, Often
Accepting, Critical
Expresses feelings openly, Keeps feeling to self

Marriage and Children

10. Expression of feelings toward children:

Score 1-5 as indicated by placement of ✓ or X:

✓ for self in first column of pair.
X for spouse in second column

Affectionate, Undemonstrative
Seldom Angry, Often
Accepting, Critical
Expresses displeasure, Keeps feeling to self

11. Rank the following statements according to how important they are in the marriage from your viewpoint:

For each column, indicate the rank number (1-5) assigned by respondent:

Being a parent
Companionship in husband and wife doing things together
Sexual relations between husband and wife
Security and comfort of family life
Mutual understanding of each other's problems and feelings

12. How satisfactory and happy is your marriage?

Code category checked, according to higher limit: 01-10

Children

13. At what age or period would you say your children were the greatest problem:

1. Infancy
2. Pre-school
3. Elementary school
4. Junior High
5. Senior High
6. After High School
7. No preference

14. What accounted for this:

Score 1 if mentioned, otherwise 2:

Dependence, timidity, lack of self-reliance of child

Demands on parental time, energy, financial resources, inadequacy of parents

Child's desire for independence, lack of respect for parents, problems of discipline

Difficulties in communication (inability of child to understand, not interpersonal tension)

Absences, illness, divorce, etc.

Outside pressures and problems - peer, school, etc.

Not classifiable

Which of these qualities do you think are most important in a teenage boy or girl:

Code 1 if not checked, 2 for others checked, 3 for most important. Go through <u>first</u> for <u>boys</u>, then for <u>girls</u>.

That he is popular with other children

That he has good manners

That he is ambitious

That he is neat and clean

That he is liked by adults

That he acts in a serious way

That he is able to defend himself

That he has self-control

That he is affectionate

That he is independent

That he obeys his parents

That he is honest

That he is dependable

That he is considerate

That he is curious

That he is a good student

Girls:

That she is popular with other children

That she has good manners

That she is ambitious

That she is neat and clean

That she is liked by adults

That she acts in a serious way

That she is able to defend herself

That she has self-control

That she is affectionate

That she is independent

That she obeys her parents

That she is honest

That she is dependable

That she is considerate

That she is curious

That she is a good student

First Oldest Child between 14 and 21 years:

If child 14-21, code 1, otherwise 2

16. Sex

1. Male
2. Female

Moral Development

17. Frequency of various responses to your children's doing something wrong:

(Score 1-5, as checked for columns 1-9):

Stop them, control them
Tell them about the bad things that could happen
Point out the way other people would be affected
Discuss and examine the various aspects of the issue
Tell them of the examples of good people
Attempt to teach them what's right and wrong
Tell them how pleased I'll be if they do right
Tell them how angry I'll be if they do wrong
Let them know how disappointed I'd be in them

18. Most typical things done (1 if checked, otherwise 2):

Stop them
Tell them about the bad things
Point out the way other people would be affected
Discuss and examine the various aspects of the issue
Tell them of the examples of good people
Attempt to teach them what's right and wrong
Tell them how pleased I'll be if they do right
Tell them how angry I'll be if they do wrong
Let them know how disappointed I'd be in them

19. How often do your children:

(Score 1-5 as checked for columns 28-30):

1. Never
2. Sometimes
3. Fairly often
4. Often
5. Very often

Question you about what's right and wrong?
Challenge you about what's right and wrong?
Change your mind about what's right and wrong?

20. How do you feel when your children ask you about what's right and wrong?

1. I don't allow them to
2. I permit it only about some things
3. I don't mind it
4. I like them to do it
5. I actively encourage them to do it

21. How do you feel about your children challenging you about what's right and wrong?

1. I don't allow them to
2. I permit it only about some things
3. I don't mind it
4. I like them to do it
5. I actively encourage them to do it

22. If you were arguing with your adolescent or young adult about a moral problem, which of the following general ideas would you ideally think would be best for you to use:

(Score as rated by respondent - 1, best to 6, least):

Their decisions should be based upon maintaining their agreements and commitments to other people and society.

Their decisions should take account of what works best for their welfare.

Their decisions should be based on the laws and rules of their country.

Their decisions should give just consideration to the rights and needs of each person involved.

Their decisions should represent the natural and kindest thing a good person would do in the particular situation.

Job Satisfaction

23. How satisfied are you with your current job?

1. Very satisfied with my job
2. Somewhat satisfied with my job
3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with my job
4. Somewhat dissatisfied with my job
5. Very dissatisfied with my job

24. How involved would you say you are in your current job?

1. Extremely involved
2. Very involved
3. Moderately involved
4. Somewhat involved
5. Not at all involved

25. How do you feel about your career?

1. It is a career I dislike and wish I could leave for another.
2. It is a career that seems best under the circumstances but is not what I would have chosen if circumstances had been different.
3. It is something I came to accept, due to circumstances more or less beyond my control, but I am not reconciled to it.
4. It approximately represents what I have wanted to do.
5. It truly represents what I wanted to do.

APPENDIX C : SUBSTAGES

The stages themselves are determined primarily by level of social perspective. The perspective of stages 1 and 2 is the ego-centric self. The perspective of stage 3 is the dyadix relationship, stage 4 the society, and that of stage 5 the perspective of a priori rights. While both substages (A and B) have the same social perspective (and hence the same stage), judgments at substage B are more equilibrated and reversible than their A counterparts. Due to this characteristic, judgments at substage B more closely approximate the formal criteria of an adequate moral judgment. For example, the response:

> SHOULD HEINZ STEAL THE DRUG?
>
> Yes, because he should take care of his wife as long as she is alive. It's what any good husband would do.

is <u>stage 3A</u>. It is unidirectional, not reversible (i.e., the judgment does not prescribe what the wife should do if she were in Heinz's shoes), is not universalizable (i.e., at most applies only to husbands), and involves no overt role-taking. In comparison, the response:

> SHOULD HEINZ STEAL THE DRUG?
>
> Yes, he should steal the drug because in a marriage each partner should care for and help the other.

is classified <u>stage 3B</u>. Here, the respondent goes beyond a mere orientation to the rules and duties of a marriage and constructs a moral judgment on the basis of an ideal marriage, one that is reversible (applies equally to both parties), universal (prescribes behavior for all marriage partners in all situations), and is mutually beneficial. However, despite their differences both responses contain the same level of social perspective, that of interpersonal concordance. They are, therefore, at the same general moral stage.

Thus, one way of determining the substage of a moral judgment is to determine the degree to which it approximates the dimensions of formal adequacy. However, a second method is to ascertain the mode under which the particular response falls. Regardless of stage, all moral judgments must be made according to one of four modes (Appendix I). Each mode corresponds to one of the four major ethical theories: utilitarianism (mode B), perfectionism (mode C), fairness (mode D), and the simple affirmation of rules, duties, and self-interests, which is called norm-following (mode A). The modes themselves are further divided into elements as shown in Appendix I. The relation of modes to substages is that modes C (perfectionism) and D (fairness) which by their very nature are more reversible and equilibrated are considered to constitute substage B while modes A (norm-following) and B (utilitarianism) constitute substage A. Another way of stating this relationship is to point out that modes C and D represent the equilibrated or "idealized" forms of the three major ethical theories (fairness, perfectionism, and utilitarianism) while modes A and B represent the unequilibrated or "factual" forms. Utilitarianism in its factual form (i.e., concerned only with consequences) is classified under substage A(mode B). In its idealized form (i.e., concerned with improving the general welfare) it is considered perfectionism (mode C, substage B). A subject who has 50% or more of his/her individual responses on a moral judgment interview rated as substage B is considered to be at that substage. Interviews that contain less than 50% of the rating at substage B are classified as substage A. The substage designation is affixed to the regular stage score.

APPENDIX D

LIFE OUTCOMES AND "BE LIKE" QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Demographics (face sheet).

2. Be-like. Rank 2-4-4-2. For #1 choice ask:

   a) Why do you want to be like that person the most?
   b) What satisfactions would you expect?
   c) What would be the responsibilities of being _____?

3. For other choices ask subject to explain briefly why they were chosen.

   [NOTE: If "good father" or "your own job" is chosen first, ask questions 2. a) - 2. c) about choice #2. These two categories will be discussed separately. Just ask a brief "why" if chosen here.]

   [NOTE: For "be like the least" categories you may ask what qualities those jobs are lacking which desired jobs have.]

*4. Own job. What is the actual title of your job?

5. Could you describe your job to me. What do you actually do on your job?

   [NOTE: Determine whether the job involves an appreciable amount of dealing with: a) people, b) data, c) tools, machines or instruments, d) administration.]

6. What are your responsibilities? How do you feel about them?

   [NOTE: Determine if subject: a) sees them as a challenge, b) is merely competent to do them, c) finds them too difficult, d) finds them boring.]

7. Do you supervise or teach anyone? (If yes): How many? In what way? How do you feel about it?

*8. Do you have any philosophy or set of attitudes about how you go about your work?

*9. What are your greatest satisfactions about your work? (Usual limit: two).

*10. Why are they satisfying?

*11. What are your greatest test dissatisfactions about your work?

*12. Why are they dissatisfying?

LIFE OUTCOMES AND "BE LIKE" QUESTIONNAIRE
(CONTINUED)

*13. What would you say are the basic moral issues you face in your work?

[NOTE: If subject needs clarification, "moral issues" = right/wrong, people's welfare.]

14. What are the aspects of your job in which you feel that you and/or others are treated fairly?

15. In what aspects of your job do you feel that you and/or others are treated unfairly?

*16. In what way do you feel that you are making a contribution to society?

*17. What do you think is an appropriate philosophy for someone in a job like yours to have?

18. Do you see any relationship between your job and your life in general? (If yes) In what way?

19. Citizenship: Are you involved in any social service, community or political or civic activities? (If yes) How many hours per week? Length of service? [Ask subject to go back three years.] Why do you engage in them?

20. Do you feel like you are a good citizen? In what way?

*21. Childrearing: In what way do you feel like you have been a good father?

*22. In what ways have you failed?

*23. What are the basic ideals a father should try to get across to his children?

*24. What kind of people would you like your children to grow up to be?

*25. When there is a conflict or disagreement about what's right between you and your oldest child, how do you usually handle it? What ideas or intentions do you have in mind?

*26. How about when there are disagreements between you and your wife? How do you handle those?

[NOTE: In Question 25 and 26, we are looking for spontaneous role-taking, seeing things from other person's perspective. If subject mentions "discussion" as the means of conflict resolution ask what he does to make discussion go well.]

*Questions analyzed in this report.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, John W. (ed.). Motives in Fantasy, Action, and Society: A method of assessment and study. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1958.

Cohen, J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1960, 20, 37-46.

Colby, A.; Kohlberg, L.; Fenton, E.; Speicher-Dubin, B.; and Lieberman, M. Secondary school moral discussion programs led by social studies teachers. Journal of Moral Education, 1977, 6, 2, 90-111.

Cook, C. D.; Sheehan, T. J.; Bargin, M.; Husted, S.; Kasey, G.; and Candee, D. Moral reasoning, clinical performance, and attitudes towards the critically ill among physicians. Pediatric Research, February 1976 (Abstract).

Crites, J. O. Vocational Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Dictionary of Occupational Titles. U.S. Department of Labor, 1965.

Fishkin, J.; Keniston, K.; and MacKinnon, C. Moral reasoning and political ideology. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1973, 27, 109-119.

Hertzberg, The Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction, 1963.

Hoffman, M., and Hoffman, L. (eds.). Review of Child Development Research. New York: Russell Sage, 1964.

Hollingshead, A. B., and Redlich, F. C. Mental Illness and Social Class. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Jencks, C. Inequality. New York: Harper, 1972.

Kohlberg, L. Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

_____. From is to ought: How to commit the naturalistic fallacy and get away with it in the study of moral development. In T. Mischel (ed.), Genetic Epistemology. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

_____. The cognitive-developmental approach to moral education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1975, 61, 10, 670-677.

Kohlberg, L.; Colby, A.; Gibbs, J.; Speicher-Dubin, B.; and Power, C. Assessing Moral Judgement Stages: A Manual. Cambridge, Mass.: Moral Education Research Foundation, 1977.

Kohlberg, L.; Hickey, J.; and Scharf, P. The justice structure of the prison: A theory and intervention. The Prison Journal, 1972, 51, 2, 3-14.

Price, ; Taylor, C. W.; Nelson, Lewis; Loughmiller ; Mathiesen ; Murray ; and Maxwell . Predicting Physician Performance, 1971.

Rest, J. Hierarchical nature of moral reasoning. Journal of Personality, 1973, 41, 86-109.

Selman, R. Personal communication, 1976.

Shoeffitt, P. The moral development of children as a function of parental moral judgments and childrearing practices. Unpublished dissertation, Graduate School, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1971.

Wasserman, E. Implementing Kohlberg's "Just Community Concept" in an alternative high school. Social Education, 1976.

MORAL DEVELOPMENT AND LIFE OUTCOMES

Daniel Candee
Richard Graham
Lawrence Kohlberg

Harvard University

NIE GRANT # NIE-6-74-0096

Submitted to the National Institute of Education

June, 1978

CG 013095

The last several years have seen major attempts to increase the complexity with which Americans reason about moral issues. Such efforts have ranged from moral education programs in all levels of schools to the passage of new ethics guidelines in nearly every professional organization and in nearly every branch of government. Given the major efforts at moral education, the present study was conducted to determine the types of lives that are led by persons who have naturally developed more sophisticated structures of moral thought. In this way it was expected that we would both deepen our understanding of the mechanisms by which moral reasoning is translated into daily behavior and would gain some picture of the types of individuals that sustained programs in moral education are likely to produce.

Our previous work in the area (Kohlberg 1969, 1971) has not been primarily concerned with the content of moral choices but with the reasoning or structure underlying such choices. By "structure" we mean the types of considerations a person uses in resolving moral problems and the principles or logic by which these considerations are tied together.

In order to measure the structure of one's moral reasoning, an individual is presented with a series of situations in which conventional values conflict. A typical story involves a husband who, after all reasonable and legal offers have failed, must decide whether to steal a drug to save his dying wife. An appeal to conventional folkways cannot resolve this dilemma. We are taught, "Thou shalt not kill," but we also learn, "Thou shalt not steal." An individual is forced not only to examine his or her reasons for accepting such values but more importantly to think about the relationship of life to law in this situation, and in general.

By following the responses of the same individuals over a period of years and in several cultures, it has been shown that the structure of moral reasoning develops through a series of six stages. The stages are of

increasing complexity; each builds upon and further expands the reasoning of the stage before. Since some individuals may still be developing while others will have stopped at various points, a cross-section of most populations will reveal persons at several of the moral stages.

The nature of individuals' lives, i.e., life outcomes, was measured in this study by the status of one's job and by an analysis of both structured and openended questions dealing with attitudes towards job, marriage, and parenting. While we were not primarily interested in job status per se, the status of one's job (s measured by the Hollingshead Index) does provide a widely used instrument which can serve as a close approximation of job responsibility. It is responsibility that we expected to be realted to the development of moral reasoning.

The following conclusions about the relation of moral reasoning to life outcomes can now be drawn:

(1) As predicted in our first hypothesis, persons at higher stages of moral development are more likely to hold higher status jobs than are persons whose moral reasoning is less developed. The correlation between moral reasoning and job status in the correlated sample (N=122) was r=.52, $p < .01$. [1]

(2) The moral reasoning-job status relationship remains significant even when education, intelligence, and father's job status are individually controlled. However, the relationship is not significant when the effects of education and intelligence are simultaneously controlled. Although moral reasoning does not predict job status beyond that predicted by the combination of education and intelligence, clear differences in job philosophies (see point 9) suggest that it is, at least partly, through the development of moral

---

1. Positive correlations are in the direction of being related to higher moral reasoning.

structures that the education and intelligence to job status link is formed. Furthermore, if we turn from job status to job responsibility, we find that moral judgment does remain a significant correlate even when the effects of education and IQ are simultaneously removed.

(3) A closer look at the moral reasoning-job status relationship reveals a theoretically meaningful pattern. At least in the Kohlberg sample, (N=55), Stage 4 reasoning was statistically necessary for the attainment of high status jobs (Table 1). Ninety-three percent of Kohlberg subjects at Stage 4 or above held jobs in the two highest status categories. This finding supports our second hypothesis. High status jobs require an individual to make decisions which will have considerable impact on the lives of others. Such decisions must often be made within an institutional framework (e.g., company, legal system, hospital), but where the individual has ultimate authority. These conditions appear to require the level of social perspective (i.e., system maintenance) emobdied in Stage 4 moral thinking.

(4) Furthermore, Stage 5 thought was associated exclusively with high status occupations (job categories 1 and 2). As hypothesized, no Stage 5 subjects were found in any of the three lowest job status categories. We can speculate that individuals who have exerted the cognitive effort required to develop advanced moral thinking are similarly motivated to achieve positions where they will have a direct hand in improving the quality of human life or in promoting justice.

We noted that the conclusions drawn in points 3 and 4 could not as clearly be made on the basis of OGS data. However, the superior quality of the moral judgment interviews in the Kohlberg sample suggests that where the two samples agree in the direction of a relationship but disagree in regard to its magnitude, the magnitude found in the Kohlberg data should be accepted.

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY OF JOB STATUS BY MORAL REASONING

IN KOHLBERG SAMPLE

Job Status	Moral Stage								Row Totals
	2(3)	3(2)	3	3(4)	4(3)	4	4(5)	5(4)	
1. Big Business Executive, Major Professional						4 (36%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	8 (15%)
2. Medium Business Executive, Lesser Professional				2 (20%)	3 (30%)	2 (18%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	10 (18%)
3. Small Business, Minor Professional	1 (100%)		3 (23%)	6 (60%)	2 (25%)	4 (36%)			16 (29%)
4. Little Business, Clerk, Salesman		1 (25%)	1 (8%)		1 (13%)			1 (25%)	4 (7%)
5. Skilled Manual			6 (46%)	2 (20%)		1 (9%)			9 (16%)
6. Semi-Skilled Manual		3 (75%)	3 (23%)		2 (25%)				8 (15%)
Column Total Percent	1 (2%)	4 (7%)	13 (24%)	10 (18%)	8 (15%)	11 (20%)	4 (7%)	4 (7%)	TOTAL N= 55 (100%)

Note: Cell entries are frequencies and column percentages.

(5) Contrary to our expectation, adolescent moral reasoning was a poor predictor of adult job status (r=.15),[2] though it was an excellent predictor of adult moral reasoning (r=.65, $p < .01$). Adolescents who are more developed in moral reasoning relative to their peers remain more developed as adults. Such persons also achieve high status jobs. However, of the many adolescents whose moral reasoning is average or below average, those whose thinking makes the greatest strides in the ensuing years are also the ones who go on to achieve high status jobs. In comparison to adolescent moral reasoning, high school grades and achievement tests both predict adult job status well. However, it appears that these measures are simply substitutes for IQ.

(6) While higher stage individuals hold more prestigious and responsible jobs, there is no evidence that they are more satisfied with them (r=.15), nor are they more satisfied with their marriages (r=.05). However, higher stage men do rate their actual jobs as coming closer to their ideal jobs than do lower stage men (.32). This effect is significant when job status is controlled.

(7) In the realm of life attitudes, the area that provided the most interesting findings involved views toward child-rearing. Previous studies have found that higher stage individuals are characterized by a preference for induction as a means of moral socialization (i.e., showing the logic of rules and behaviors) and by a rejection of love withdrawal. Our results confirmed the rarity with which love withdrawal is used by higher stage subjects (r=-.33) and confirmed the use of discussion (part of the induction syndrome) as the most typical moral socialization technique (r=.28, $p < .05$).

---

2. Subsequent correlations are based on either Kohlberg sample (N=55) or OGS (N=66). No measure was studied in both samples.

In the area of values transmission, higher stage fathers were characterized by their refection of a spate of "conventional" traits for their children (e.g., obedience, studiousness, manners) and by their support of "independence". Evidence that the valuing of independence is put into practice stems from the finding that higher stage fathers more often encourage their children to make their own decisions on moral issues and even to challenge decisions made by the parents themselves. The content of moral philosophies espoused by higher stage fathers teaches their children to maintain commitments to others and society (r=.25) and to be sensitive to the rights and needs of other individuals. In comparison, lower stage fathers more often encourage their children to make moral decisions based on obedience (r=-.24) and on the avoidance of punishment as well as on respect for rules and laws (r=-.34).

(8) In regard to behavior, higher stage men are more active in political events (r= 24) even after education and political orientation is controlled. It therefore appears that an increase in moral reasoning is directly related to an increase in political participation, a finding which underscores the need for moral education in a healthy democracy.

In contrast to lower stage men, the leisure time activities of high moral reasoners are marked by greater attendance at concerts, theatres, professional meetings, and by reading. However, such activity is as likely to be due to the effect of education as it is to moral thought.

(9) In regard to the strategies and philosophies with which individuals go about their jobs, parenting, and marital interaction, the thinking of higher stage men is distinguished by a greater orientation to the themes of developing ideal social relations and promoting justice. While lower stage subjects showed greater concern with what Hertzberg (1963) has called hygiene factors (pay, hours, promotion), higher stage individuals saw their

jobs as opportunities to understand the perspective of clients and to further the clients' welfare. Some of these differences are no doubt due to actual differences in the types of jobs that are held by higher and lower stage men. However, the same differences in thinking also seem to guide the parenting and marital behaviors of these same individuals. For example, lower stage men consider themselves to be good fathers if they have simply provided the basic material and emotional necessities of life (food, love, education). In comparison, the standards set by higher stage fathers include an understanding of their children's unique perspective and personalities and an encouragement of their children to develop relationships with others.

Perhaps, the most important single feature which distinguishes the thinking of higher stage individuals is the ability to see a situation from the perspective of another and to appreciate that other's particular values, goals, and constraints. It is such reasoning that provides the basis for improved or ideal interpersonal relations. We have seen evidence of such role-taking ability in the job and parenting philosophies of higher stage men. However, its clearest evidence occurs in the method by which marital conflicts are resolved. Both higher and lower stage men report that they have resorted to emotional outbursts during conflicts with their wives. This seems to have been especially common in the early days of marriage. However, great differences did arise in the manner in which individuals handled their emotional outbursts and in the strategies that were developed to resolve disputes in the future. Lower stage men continued to resolve disputes either through shouting or through a demand for concession by one of the parties. In comparison, higher stage individuals attempt to see the dispute from the wife's viewpoint, trying to understand the reasons for, and validity of, her claim. Such role-taking

activity most frequently leads to attempts at consensus, a rational procedure by which both viewpoints are respected and subject to change. While higher stage men develop a strategy that is oriented to a solution of the problem, lower stage men seem to be consumed with an evaluation of the personalities of the would be resolvers.

In summary, then, we may conclude that individuals who differ in moral reasoning have been found not only to achieve different stations in life, but also to have considerably different values and strategies by which they conduct their lives. If these are the kinds of values and strategies that are deemed desirable to enable a vibrant democratic society to exist, then continued efforts at moral education seem to be called for.